National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XX. NO. 23. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1859. WHOLE NO. 1,011.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

107 *North Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

RATE OF ADVERTISING, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

BAD TASTE IN BOSTON.

From The Journal of Commerce.

DURING the repetition of Mr. Everett's eulogy on Daniel Webster at Boston, petitions for the removal of the Webster statue were circulated among the audience, and, it is said, were numerously signed. It is scarcely probable that such a mean mark of disrespect to the favorite orator of Massachusetts, and such an untimely and indecent insult to the memory of Daniel Webster, can meet the approval of any reputable portion of the citizens of Boston. It is only another illustration of the vulgarity and virulence of the "Down-East" Abolitionists.

Simultaneously with this exhibition of bad taste on the part of the Bostonians towards their greatest living orator, and their greatest dead or living statesman, comes a proposition to erect a statue to the late Horace Mann on the State House grounds, immediately opposite to that of Webster. It is possible that Mann, like many other New Englanders of extreme theories and ill-rounded judgments, deserves a statue, although his reputation is not very great out of his own State; but he differed as far from Mr. Webster in mental dimensions as in principles, and in the comprehension of the constitutional duties and powers of the Federal Government. Moreover, he was a life-long opponent and enemy of Webster, on a small scale; and this new proposition, coming from the source and in the manner and time it does, is evidently only another exhibition of pique against the latter, which the Legislature, in their devotion to the extreme anti-slavery party, will probably indulge. There is only one further tribute which the modern Athens can pay to modern Art, worthy of the development in that quarter of modern ideas, and that is the erection on the same spot of an ebony statue of a strapping negro. After having placed Webster in such company, it is probable that even the Abolitionists would be contented.

From the same.

Doctor Cheever, in the memorial to Congress, which he sought to foist upon the American Board, asks of the Senate and House of Representatives "to cause the law of the land against the foreign slave trade to be rigorously enforced."

Before the Reverend D.D. shall have the additional title of LL.D. conferred upon him, we trust he may become sufficiently versed in public law, and especially in the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, to know that the duty of enforcing laws, whether rigorously or otherwise, belongs, not to the Legislative, but to the Executive department of the Government. Had this plain fact been known to him, he might have saved himself the trouble of asking the Board to memorialize Congress to enforce the laws against the slave trade. But "where ignorance is bliss, 'twere folly to be wise," and Dr. Cheever so delights in the felicity of ignorance on this subject that if the light of wisdom were once shed upon his pathway, his happiness, which appears to consist in introducing the abolition firebrand into religious and benevolent organizations, would be seriously impaired.

From the same.

HARD TO PLEASE.—The New Bedford *Mercury* styles the recent course of the American Board upon the slave trade resolutions an "Abolition bobbery"—finding fault because they referred the resolutions to the Business Committee, instead of passing them at once. The Board cut off the Choctaw Mission to conciliate the Abolitionists, and consented to give consideration to other topics on slavery for a like reason; but they would have fared equally well if they had made no concessions of this kind, for *The Mercury* says, "of such people, afraid of their own shadows, we have surely had enough of union." "The Churches will and have already in some instances resolved to send no more of their means to a Society thus recreant to Christian principles. Decidedly we think they are altogether in the right." So it seems the Board is in a fair way to lose the support of those whom they inordinately strove to please. It is to be hoped that those Churches which have so summarily resolved to withdraw their aid may "have their reward," and that the Board may learn wisdom from experience, and not trust too much hereafter to the plausibility of pretended friends who are riding the Abolition hobby to excess, and are indifferent whether they carry the missionary burden behind or before, or trample it under foot, provided they subserve their main object.

A NOSEGAY FOR THE SOUTHERN FUSIONISTS.

From The (Washington) States.

THE Massachusetts House of Representatives on Saturday last struck out the word "white" from that section of the Revised Statutes which provided that "every able-bodied white male citizen shall be enrolled in the militia." This was done by a vote of 83 to 25, and is intended to legally constitute the negro military a part of the militia of that State.

In case of war, and a negro company should be drafted by Massachusetts to answer a requisition of the United States upon her for troops, would it be very agreeable for those Southern men who are clamoring for a fusion with the Black Republicans to see these negroes, made soldiers by their Northern allies, march in transit to the seat of war through slave territory? Would they greet them with applause and other ovations for their black gallantry? Would they dine them and toast them therefor?

Nay, more; should the concern now affected by these Southern fusionists for their poor country, for fear the Democracy may ruin it, be substituted (which we doubt) by a like amount of unaffected valor in case of a war, would it please the immortal Botts, the fighting Brownlow, *et id omne genus*, to march side by side to battle and to glory with these *strong* soldiers, the creation of their abolition compeers? We pity their nostrils if they can stand the association.

The Republicans of Massachusetts, who have done this, are composed in the greater part of men who were once part and parcel of the same political organization with the Southern fusionists, bound by a common oath and acted upon by a like prejudice—a prejudice which led those of them in power in Massachusetts to disarm a part of the militia because its members were sons of the isle that gave a Montgomery and Shields to the military history and renown of America.

Think of it, men of the South: you are asked to fuse with an opposition at the North which did not hesitate to deprive white citizens of the United States of their arms because they were Irishmen, and who now give them to negroes for no other reason than because the idea is abhorrent to you.

THE "ETERNAL NIGGER."

From The St. Louis Republican.

WE observe that Dr. Cheever, in his customary *rôle* of firebrand, has attended a meeting of the Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, for the purpose apparently of disturbing its proceedings, by trying to commit it to a warfare upon American slavery. Certain Black Republican papers tell us that the Republican party desires that every State and Territory should act its pleasure on the slavery question. But its three thousand preachers who are affiliated with that party—of which Dr. Cheever is one—act very differently. In their minds, as in Seward's, there is ever present the feeling of the "irrepressible conflict."

As before the Board of Missions, so in the New York Episcopal Convention, we find the same conflict urged forward. Mr. Jay invited that body to consider and pass a series of anti-slavery resolutions which he prepared in the most approved Gerrit-Smith-Giddings-Lloyd-Garrison style. The lay and clerical Episcopalians could not, however, be made to see the connection between Church government and the "nigger question," and therefore, notwithstanding the eloquence of Mr. Jay, declined to discuss his resolutions.

Confined to State or Territorial Legislatures, and to slavery as a *home* question, no rational man will object to the mooting or agitation of the question. Beyond those precincts and for other purposes, the motive which urges to it must be either a sinister or a fanatical one. It seeks to open a controversy at improper times and improper places.

A PUFF OF FOUL AIR.

From Dr. Bellows's Sequel to "The Suspense of Faith."

I CONCEDE to private judgment, in respect of religion, just what I or you concede to it in respect of science, politics, society, manners, literature, or taste. We use it all necessarily and rightly, but at our peril. Experience proves that peril to be not small. Despising or forgetting this peril, the right of private judgment in its abuse has made Robespieres in politics, Rousseaus in social philosophy, Mary Woolstoncrafts in theories of manners; and now, while the use of private judgment is the light-house of modern social seamanship, its abuse is the rock at its base on which modern society is threatened with wreck and ruin. That abuse creates contempt for public opinion, questions common sense, disputes axioms, defies experience, and, for the wheel of the planets and the sowing of the stars, would plough the heavens with comets only. It is the origin of the law-defying, custom-breaking, dignity-despising, liberty-infringing spirit which now rules in our philanthropic projects and schemes, in which the hard logic of private right and private conscience routs the soft resistance made by the unstatable, because infinite instincts and affections of a nature richest in its social and common truths. Under this pirate flag of strict individualism, the English Roundhead, and the French sans-culottes, and the modern Calvinist, and the American Abolitionist, and the Southern filibuster, and the anti-this-and-that of all the schools, are logically ranged together. They think the bundle of sticks no stronger than all the sticks taken separately; the race no wiser than all its members; the Church no more sacred than the Churches; the truth noways different from the reasons they can give for it; that what they cannot prove, cannot be true; and what they say, which is not answered, must therefore be accepted and believed. Accordingly, they can put down public amusements with a text of Scripture, or upset law and order with a scruple of conscience, or dissolve the Union with a phrase from Isaiah, or order the Chief Justice of Massachusetts and the President of Harvard into the pillory with a shred or two of chopped logic. It is upon this conceit of private infallibility, worse than Papal or biblical, ending in the deification of intellect, that the Bloomerism, and anti-classicism, and ultraisms respecting meats and drink, and all the sour and violent reforms of the day, now rest—if rest can be associated for a moment with their names; and no peace, nor comfort, nor sanity will return, until the wisdom, and truth, and geniality of humanity, as the child and pupil of God, are welcomed back in a deeper social philosophy, a profounder politics, an humbler religion.

THE "GREAT" VILIFIER.

From The New York Observer.

MR. YEADON styled Mr. Everett "the great laudator" of Washington. Wendell Phillips may be called the great vilifier in general. One of the daily papers attributes his periodical overflow of bile to monomania, but the man is not mad yet. What he may come to, it would not be safe to predict. He gave the opening lecture last week, in a course at Boston, on no subject in particular, and everything in general, the hour being spent in spitting upon everybody and everything but the little clique of mutual admirers to which Garrison, Theodore Parker, Phillips and two or three more belong. Even poor Dr. Bellows of our city, who was thought *liberal* enough to be let off easily by the Boston critics, was handled without mercy and spoken of as

"One who lives by venturing a bold theory to-day, and spending to-morrow in taking it back, finding that he has been

'Dropping buckets into empty wells,
And growing old in drawing nothing out,'

he assures you that it is not cowardice, but lack of candles and a liturgy that makes him useless."

And of Daniel Webster, he said:

"If any noble soul in the State will stir our mother Massachusetts to behead his image, we will sacredly cherish the name of that true Massachusetts boy."

And a *Boston* audience cheered the sentiment with loud and prolonged applause. We know not which most to pity, the man who can thus insult the memory of the noblest statesman New England has produced, or an audience that would cheer him in his infamous discourse.

A GENTLE REBUKE.

From The Detroit Free Press.

THE Protestant Episcopal Church treats differently than some of the other Churches attempts to introduce the nigger question into its conventions and other deliberations. Every such attempt has been met at the threshold and repulsed. Such an attempt has just been thus met in the Diocesan Convention of New York. We copy from a report of the proceedings:

"Mr. John Jay presented a petition to the convention that it should express its reprobation of the slave trade, and otherwise encourage a sound Christian sentiment on the subject. Mr. Jay warmly advocated a resolution to refer the paper to three clergymen and three laymen, who should report thereon to the next convention. The document was not accepted."

No one answered Mr. Jay's speech; but when he had finished, the convention voted, unanimously with the exception of Mr. Jay, that it would not receive the paper. The thing was done as quietly as it was promptly. No apology was made for the course adopted, the convention—unlike the American Tract Society, which adopted a similar course at its last meeting—not deeming it necessary to justify action which justified itself in the minds of all sensible people. Mr. Jay had presumed to introduce a foreign and irrelevant question, and he was permitted to withdraw it without an angry word from any quarter. The rebuke was all the more severe that it was so gently administered.

THE STANDARD.

"IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT" IN THE A. B. C. F. M.

THE CHOCTAW MISSION—DR. CHEEVER'S SPEECH—THE SLAVE TRADE—DR. CHEEVER'S MEMORIAL—THE SPIRIT OF COMPROMISE TRIUMPHANT.

THE question of slavery was introduced at the annual meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, held in Philadelphia, in two distinct ways. It came up first in connection with that part of the Report of the Prudential Committee which announced that the connection of that mission with the Board had been severed. The Report made no mention of the cause of this rupture, the Boston managers, hoping, doubtless, that such reticence on their part would prevent an unpleasant discussion. The fact of the discontinuance of the mission, for reasons connected with slavery, had been previously announced by *The New York Observer*, and we learn that a caucus of certain members of the Board, opposed to the action of the Prudential Committee, had been held in this city, for the purpose of taking measures to secure a reversal of that action by the Board. The majority of the Committee of the Board, to whom the subject was referred, consisted of persons in substantial sympathy with the views of the caucus, and their report recommended that the mission should be continued for another year, and that a special committee be appointed to consider the whole matter and report at the meeting of the Board next year. This report, designed to defeat a measure having for its object the severance of the Board from its connection with slavery through the Choctaw mission, was introduced by the Rev. Albert Barnes, who, notwithstanding he has recorded many fine anti-slavery sentiments in a book, is always sure to be found on the pro-slavery side of every practical issue relating to the subject. The minority report, prepared by Hon. Linus Child of Massachusetts, while it expressed "the highest respect, confidence and affection for the devoted men connected with this mission," recommended a concurrence with the action of the Prudential Committee.

The presentation of these reports led to an excited discussion, which was protracted till after midnight!

MR. CHILD spoke in defence of the minority report and of the action of the Prudential Committee. He is thus reported by *The New York Observer*.

"Mr. Child said he wished to give the precise state of the question. The Prudential Committee have discontinued the mission. They have exercised a power which belongs to them, and which they have often exercised before. The effect of their action is that the connection between this Board and the Choctaw Mission is severed. It is a completed act. It does not need the approval of this Board to make it valid. The Board can, if they choose, rescind and reverse the action of the Committee. Mr. C. then proceeded to review the history of the case. He said the first action was taken at Worcester, in 1844. A committee was then appointed to inquire and report. In 1845 the report was made at Brooklyn by the late Dr. Woods. This report met the approbation of the Choctaw Mission. The connection of this mission with slavery continued to excite so much attention that Mr. Treat was sent to visit the mission. In 1848, he made his report, and the same year a written statement of the views of the Choctaw and Cherokee missionaries was made. As the result of these the Prudential Committee, in June, 1848, sent a reply to the Choctaw Mission known as the *Treat Letter*. That letter embodied the opinions of the Prudential Committee, and was adopted by them with great unanimity. That letter was adopted by the Board, and its principles endorsed at Hartford in 1854. Owing to a difference of opinion between the missionaries and the Prudential Committee, Rev. Mr. Wood visited the mission, and an agreement was effected, which it was supposed had set the matter forever at rest. The Prudential Committee afterwards received a letter from four of the Choctaw missionaries, expressing their dissent from the interpretation which had been put upon the terms of this agreement, and resigning their connection with the Board. The Prudential Committee wrote a reply, dated Nov. 13, 1855, requesting them to reconsider their resignation. They replied, proposing certain conditions on which they would withdraw their resignation. These conditions were that the Board should withdraw all their past action on the subject of slavery, and leave the missionaries to act in regard to it according to their enlightened judgment, and the principles of the Word of God. It was impossible for a moment to entertain this proposition. Other letters have passed between the Prudential Committee and the missionaries. In 1856 the missionaries wrote that they could not accede to the letter of 1848, or conduct the missions on that basis. In their last letter, received within two or three months, they state that they adhere to the principles contained in their letter of 1856. Thus the matter stands. On the one hand is the letter adopted at Hartford in 1854, containing a plain statement of principles on which the missions are to be conducted. On the other the missionaries say they cannot adopt and act upon those principles. This difference is fundamental to the organization of this Board. After having adopted the principles contained in the letter of 1848, can we allow the missionaries to say that they cannot adopt or act upon them? What are the principles of the letter of 1848, known as the Treat letter? They are the very same as those contained in the Report of Dr. Woods, adopted by this Board in 1845. There is no difference. The main point is this: the declaration that the system of American slavery as it exists in the United States is a wrong one—is sinful. (Mr. C. here read extracts from Dr. Wood's report.) This report makes a difference between the system and slaveholding; the one is wrong—the other may not be, but one who approves and assists in carrying out the system is sinning. Another principle in Mr. Treat's letter is that in examining candidates for church membership, if the candidate gives good evidence of a change of heart, he is to be admitted to the Church, and of this the missionary is to be the sole judge. But the letter says that slavery is opposed to the principles of the Gospel and proceeds to apply the principles of Dr. Wood's report to the practical duties of the missionaries. It says that where there are slaveholding converts, it is the duty of the missionaries to inquire into their views on the subject of slavery, and instruct them in regard to a system which the Board has declared contrary to the principles of the Gospel. If the missionaries cannot be permitted to instruct the people on the subject according to their views, and when the missionaries have given in their ultimatum—that they cannot conduct the missions on the principles laid down by this Board in 1848—shall the mission be continued? Is this Board prepared to say that the action of the Prudential Committee shall be reversed; that the principles which the Board has adopted are all wrong? This is the ground that must be taken—that we must not carry out the principles of the Gospel in regard to all sin. We do not claim ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Churches, but we must have power to recall our missionaries and withhold supplies. You cannot conduct your Foreign Missions unless the Board have this power. If you surrender your right to establish such principles as in the case of the Choctaw Mission, you surrender all your power. The best that can be done for this mission is to let them seek some other connection. There is another Board all around them. The missionaries are all Old School Presbyterians, and they can form a connection with that Board."

Dr. Anderson, one of the Secretaries of the Board, is thus reported by the same paper.

"The issue presented by the majority of the Committee will do great injustice to the Prudential Committee. It is not simply a matter of opinion, as stated, about which we differ. There are found to be great difficulties in carrying on this mission. Positive instructions have been given to the missionaries, which they have disregarded. We all, or most of us, believed that it was not possible for us to carry on that mission any longer; and believing that the mission could get along without us, the Prudential Committee voted to discontinue it."

DR. CHEEVER, at this point, threw a bomb-shell into the meeting by moving the following amendment or addition to the report concerning the Choctaw and Cherokee Churches:

"Your Committee add that in the opinion of the Board the holding of slaves should be pronounced an immorality inconsistent with membership in any Christian Church, and that it should be required that these Missionary Churches should immediately put away from themselves this sin, and should cease to sanction it even in appearance."

In support of this amendment he read a speech which the *New York Evangelist* pronounces "a bit of an infliction." What reasons that paper had for such a characterization of the speech our readers shall have the means of judging.

DR. CHEEVER'S SPEECH.

Dr. Cheever proposed this amendment because, for the redemption of the Board from the imputation already brought against it of complicity with the sin of slavery, it was bound to give to the world some such expression of its views; and this seemed the only occasion. It was not to be endured that through the attitude and influence of this Board in the sanction of slavery, the power of the Church with the Gospel of God against this sin should be hindered and weakened. But so it has been, while this Board had Churches under its charge to whose communion slaveholders were admitted as Christians. Whenever this is done, the power of the Church in her appeal against slavery is destroyed. But not only so, such an appeal convicts the Church of hypocrisy and leads the world to infidelity; for how can the world respect a Church that is seen receiving to her own fellowship and defending, on grounds of expediency, that which she denounces to the world as a sin? And such is the gross and shameful inconsistency in any Church professing to regard slavery as wrong, and warning the world against it in the name of God, and yet admitting slaveholders, the only persons under heaven who practise the sin and make merchandise of men, to the Lord's table in good and regular standing as Christian merchants in human flesh. If slaveholding be permitted in the Christian Church, neither that crime nor the system that grows out of it can be condemned by the Church, nor made to appear sinful in the eye of the world. But if made to appear by other efforts, influences and teachings than those of the Church; if made to appear sinful by the world's philanthropists taking higher and more consistent ground than the Church takes; if made so to appear by the common conscience of the Church, under the law written on their hearts—the common sentiment and impulse of mankind compelling them to regard slaveholding as oppressive and unchristian, while the Christian conscience, debauched and stupefied, proclaims it as a virtue, or if wrong in the beginning yet passed into a necessity and a virtue, by expediency, by long possession and practice, on the principle of wrong becoming right because of the difficulty of undoing the wrong, and the long-continued and accumulating profits of the wrong passing into a vested system, sanctioned and protected by law; because, also, of the wrong, with its profits and its means of living, passing into an inheritance, and having descended from slaveholders to their families, from menstealers to their children, from planters to their households, as a domestic institution; if the conscience of the Church, on these grounds, demands its toleration, demands the admission of slaveholders into the Church by the right of possession in crime, by the principle of squatter sovereignty on the premises of God passing into sacred, sanctifying custom, and being exalted into law, then the conscience of the world must inevitably oppose and despise the conscience of the Church as an unchristian conscience; the moral sense of the world cannot do otherwise than reject such a piety as unsound and rotten, such professed godliness as an abomination, such orthodoxy and benevolence as hypocrisy and a lie.

The dealings and character of the Church become condemned and vile in the sight of the world *on the points of common justice and humanity between man and man*; and, if the Church were the only hope of the world's salvation in such a case—if the world's knowledge and reception of true piety depended on the Church—there would be no hope, no possible redemption. The world will set the Word of God itself against the Church, and the Church must become a scoffing and a by-word. Here is the alternative: either a total blank infidelity, or else the reception and belief of a false, anti-Christian, slaveholding Christianity; either the reception of the Word and rejection of the Church, or the rejection of the Word and reception of the Church. Either the Church is false or the Word is false. Which dilemma is to be adopted? Or will the world, unable to distinguish between the Church and the Word, reject both together? Such is the frightful gulf which the practice of any sin by the Church, though condemned in the Word of God, opens before us. Now, if there is any sin at all in slavery, slaveholding is that sin. And, if the system of slaveholding is wrong, the slaveholder himself is the sinner. There could be no such thing as slavery if the slaveholder himself did not voluntarily hold slaves. If he holds them not as slaves, but as freemen, denying any man's right to them as property, but only to protect them from being held as slaves, then he is not a slaveholder. If, in such a case, he is compelled, in order to keep the power of protecting them, to *seem* to be a slaveholder, then, in order to avoid the appearance of evil, and preserve the Church from seeming to sanction the crime of slaveholding, he ought to be kept out of the Church, in order that slaveholding be not brought in and sanctioned.

The pretence of injustice toward a good man, in keeping him out of the Church because of his entanglement in this sin, must not be made a shield for the continuance of the injustice of slavery. It might just as well be argued that murder is not sin *per se*, because murder is simply the killing of a man; but the sheriff also kills a man when he hangs the murderer, and, therefore, murder cannot be indicted as sin *per se*, since the sheriff has to do murder as a virtue. The Church may not seem to do evil, and thus embolden others to practice the evil, and maintain it as a right. Rather than embolden the world to practise slavery by letting them imagine, from the admission of slaveholding to the Church, that slaveholding is not essentially sinful, but may consist with piety and the will of God, let every slaveholder in appearance be kept out of the Church, that the slaveholders in reality may not get in. Ten thousand evil examples out of the Church are not so bad as one within. Hence the indignation, sarcasm, contempt, against rum-selling deacons. Hence the very popular storm of rebuke against the American Tract Society for its course in protecting the iniquity of slavery. It is a singular contradiction when those who accuse the Tract Society for covering up this sin refuse to call upon the American Board not to sanction it, or even denounce as Abolition agitators those who ask the Board to keep this sin out of the Churches. The American Board itself, in 1836, passed a resolution forbidding the missionaries to hire slaves, even though at the wish of the slaves, and for the purchase of their freedom, because this could not be done without incurring the reputation of slaveholding. So careful were the Board at that time of their Christian reputation that they said, "As it has appeared to the Committee that, in consequence of these transactions, the Board, or its missionaries, have been regarded by some as holding slaves, therefore resolved that the missionaries among the South-Western Indians be instructed to enter into no more such contracts, and to relinquish all such contracts." This is certainly the right principle. But if proper to be applied to the hiring of slaves, how much more to the holding of them by church-members; how much more to the exclusion of such slaveholders from the Church? and if the imputation upon missionaries themselves of being slaveholders was so injurious, and so anxiously to be avoided, why not also in the case of church-members? Is it more sinful for a missionary to hold slaves than for any church-member? Or can the Board any more easily afford to wink at slavery in the missionary churches than in the missionary households? In either case it is such an enormity that the Board ought not to be willing for a moment to incur the imputation of it. The Board ought to have placed themselves in absolute and total opposition to this wickedness in any shape. As a Board of Commissioners for the salvation of the African race, they might annually have renewed their testimony against slavery, and their demand for its abolition in various appropriate and powerful modes. At any rate they should carefully have avoided sactioning it, even in appearance. They have had it for 48 years directly in their way, directly beneath their power, directly calling for action against it. Under the system of inaction and indifference, it has so maintained its ground that at length not only the ecclesiastical bodies that maintain the system which makes them the reproach of Christendom stand ready to receive and nourish the slaveholding Churches, but the politicians, and the whole slaveholding policy and power of the United States, are waiting to receive a slave State, a new slave State into the Union, from under the favorable tuition and moulding of the religion of the Board for nearly fifty years! Experience shows that the only attack with the Word of God against sin which cannot be evaded is that which designates the sinner, and not merely the system. If any door of industrial apology or exception be opened, the whole system rides through it. The General Assembly of 1850 resolved that "the holding of our fellow-men in the condition of slavery, except in those cases where it is unavoidable by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity, is an offence in the proper import of that term as used in the Book of Discipline." Through that exception all the slaveholders in the land immediately passed in procession, as by an enlargement in the eye of the needle all the camels in the world, with all their accumulation of luggage, may be seen marching into the kingdom of heaven. In the Assembly of 1855, the Presbytery of Winchester, in Virginia, notified the Assembly and all the Churches that the exceptions stated in the resolutions of the Assembly were considered to cover the vast majority of cases, if not every case, of slaveholding in the land; and in an address to their constituents, published after the adjournment of the Assembly, united in by the body of representatives from the Southern States, the same thing was avowed in terms more unqualified, and at greater length. Since that time, the kingdom of salvation by slaveholding suffereth violence, and all are pressing upon it, and the violent take it by force. It is now asserted that the obligations of guardianship, the demands of humanity, and the dictates of the highest piety, as well as the laws of the slaveholding States, require the perpetuity of the system, and constitute, for every case of slaveholding, a case of good intention, justificatory motives and circumstances, and of religious expediency and necessity. The state of the conflict in our country, the aggressions of the Slave Power, the impious doctrines advanced and avowed in behalf of slavery as a righteous system, the most unfortunate and disastrous complicity of the Board hitherto with it, as well as the claims of the millions crushed by it, forbid that the Board should any longer refuse an open attitude against it, or should neglect any of the precious opportunities offered in the providence of God effectually to oppose it, or should relinquish their power over it and their hold upon it, until they have administered all those means of grace to it which God has given in his word, all those agencies of reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, and all that authority of discipline committed to the Churches against such a sin for its removal. If the Board deliver up this authority and power, which is greater than the strength of Samson against Dagon, they will play the Delilah to the Philistines, without even the eleven hundred pieces of silver; nay, their treasury will be emptier than ever, and their moral dignity will be degraded irreparably by such a transaction. On the other hand, if they let this iniquity off; if, instead of opening the prison door and letting the oppressed go free, they let the iniquity and those who practise it go free; if they let this moral monster in the Church of Christ escape out of their hands, whom God has denounced as worthy of death, and whom God has laid bound before them in the very act and character of his wickedness for their authoritative application of the sentence of God's Word, then they will be more guilty than the besotted Ahab, king of Israel, when, out of pretended humanity, peace, and worldly wisdom, he released, unscathed, the enemy of his country and his God. "Thus saith the Lord, Because thou hast let go out of thy hand a man whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore, thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people." The Board have no right to let slavery escape, or to refuse to execute God's commission against it, and, least of all, on the ground of the difficulty of confronting it and dealing with it, when in his good providence he has laid this giant sin on his own altar before them, and given them the Sword of the Spirit to plunge into its heart. Let them stand and exercise this royal priesthood against sin. A grander occasion, a more solemn and illustrious opportunity of striking such a blow, could not be asked by them. It is as a Mount Carmel in the gaze of the world, who have seen us travelling up hither as to a challenge of the trial of power between God and Baal. Let the Board, before renouncing its guardianship of these Churches, apply the truth of God and the discipline of Christ's house to them, and put away this sin, and then, if the path of duty is plain to give them over to some other pupilage, it can be done with honor, in faithfulness to Christ, but not till then. The Board ought not to relinquish their trust with these Churches till they can do it with clean hands—till they have either cast out the demoniac possession that afflicts them, or have brought them to Jesus, and laid them at his feet for this purpose. But here they are advised to give over these uncured sufferers, whom Satan hath bound and tormented these many years, into the hands of doctors who do not regard the possession as the work of Satan, or as any affliction or iniquity at all, but, on the contrary, as the minister of an angel of light, and a desirable instrumentality of God's most holy missionary providence. You propose, if you agree to this, transferring over your patient to these new guardians—in effect, to say: "Take him; we can make nothing of him; he is more plague than profit—a very obstinate, incurable devil, whom the world and the Christian Abolitionists will not suffer us to keep any longer as a saint. But you can take him as a child of God, and nourish him with food convenient for him, and harness him for a work of glory in your own missionary field. With you it is a work of love; with us it is nothing but toil, difficulty, embarrassment and danger." We cannot, in faithfulness to our trust, in honor to God's Word, or with any dignity or safety to ourselves, pursue any such policy as this. We are driven to the wall, and cannot refuse to "stand up for Jesus," in the true meaning of that watchword here, where that watchword was issued from the dying lips of that young soldier of Christ, who is known to have spoken it in reference to this very conflict against slavery, and to have meant by it, with all the dying emphasis of those principles for which he had been excluded from his former church, and had gathered around him a new band, "Stand up for Jesus in protection of the cause of the dumb and down-trodden slave, with the gospel of the abolition of this wickedness." That was what young Tyng meant; and when we see young and old, Young Men's Christian Associations, churches, assemblies, missionary societies, holding back from its reality, rejecting and denying its true meaning, and yet boasting of it in another sense, we tremble at the last words of Malachi, and cannot but feel that except God turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers, in this thing, he must come and smite the land with a curse.

Dr. Cheever's amendment found no support whatever, except that it was seconded by his brother. It was laid on the table "unanimously."

The majority and minority reports were laid on the table, on motion of Dr. Patton.

REV. HENRY T. CHEEVER offered a resolution to the effect that the Prudential Committee be instructed to carry on the Choctaw Mission and appoint such missionaries as will comply with the instructions of the Prudential Committee. This was unanimously laid on the table.

Finally, at 1 o'clock, a. m., on Friday morning, after much excitement, the Board adopted the Report of the Prudential Committee, thus deciding in favor of discontinuing the Choctaw Mission.

In what light this decision is regarded by the hunker pro-slavery party, the following remarks of the *New York Observer* will show:

"The deplorable result has been produced by a supposed necessity of yielding to the dictates of 'Christian expediency.' In the Choctaw Mission Churches there are a few pious men who still hold slaves, and many friends of the Board are unwilling to contribute to its funds, while any of the Churches in its missions retain slaveholders in their fellowship. The Prudential Committee has for many years been embarrassed by the clamor of these friends, and it is alleged that funds have been withheld by Churches that would otherwise have contributed. It is the firm persuasion of good men that the Board would be more heartily sustained by many Churches if it were entirely severed from connection with Churches in which any slaveholders are tolerated. The missionaries, also, have been charged with abolitionism, because they are sustained by this Board, and it has been thought that their position would be strengthened among the Choctaws by the withdrawal of a Board which is regarded there as decidedly anti-slavery.

"These considerations and others have led the majority of the Prudential Committee to believe, conscientiously, that it is for the interest of the Board and the cause of missions generally to separate from the Choctaw mission, and leave it to be supported by others whom God will raise up for its help.

"It is needless to say that in this view of expediency we do not concur. Our sentiments have been so often and freely expressed, we need not repeat them now. And we have reason to believe that a majority of the corporate members of the Board coincide with us on this great question. But many of them, believing that there was no use in resisting the action of the Prudential Committee, absented themselves from the meeting in Philadelphia, and suffered the work of separation to be done without their opposition. Corporate members of the Board have wept together over the expected and inevitable result. The Rev. Dr. Stearns, of Newark, N. J., gave utterance to the feelings with which the action of the Board will be regarded by thousands of its warmest and truest friends."

THE SLAVE TRADE—MEMORIAL PRESENTED BY DR. CHEEVER.

On Thursday, October 6th, Dr. CHEEVER created an intense excitement by the presentation of the following draft of a Memorial to Congress on the subject of the Foreign Slave Trade:

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States the memorial and petition of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions respectfully represents as follows:

"That your memorialists are an incorporated body, by an Act of the Legislature of Massachusetts of 1812, and that they are engaged in propagating the Gospel in foreign heathen lands and among the Indian tribes of this country, by supporting missionaries, diffusing a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, establishing schools, and in all proper ways extending the blessings of civilization and Christianity. The Board, however, is neither an ecclesiastical nor a denominational body, and is not supported by denominations as such, but by individual Christians, ministers of different denominations and laymen.

"Your memorialists further represent, that they have for many years sustained missions in Africa among the Zulu and Gaboon tribes, which have had encouraging success. It is known to your memorialists, and to all who are conversant with the history of Africa, that one of the principal obstructions to the progress of civilization and the extension of Christianity in that country is the domestic slave trade, which owes its origin and prevalence chiefly to the foreign slave trade, which introduces intoxicating drinks and implements of cruelty and death, stirs up contention among the tribes, produces vast and desolating wars and leads to the most debasing vices and crimes, so that it is a well established fact that the excess of barbarism on the Western coast especially is the effect of the foreign slave trade, and that in the interior, beyond the reach of that influence, the negroes are far more civilized, industrious and peaceful. Along the shores of Africa wherever the foreign slave trade is carried on, the natives form the worst and most wretched population of the whole continent. There is more drunkenness than elsewhere, greater cruelty, a lower morality, more crime, more misery of every kind than is ever seen where the foreign slave trade does not prevail. It is the policy of slave-traders to corrupt the natives by intoxicating drinks and other appliances, that they may have power over them, and that they may more successfully carry on their iniquitous traffic.

"In view of these considerations, and of all that pertains to the welfare of the African tribes, and especially those over which the Board exerts a beneficial influence, your memorialists, in common with a large portion of the people of the United States, feel a deep concern at the recommencement, on the part of the citizens of the country, of the African slave trade. Cargoes of Africans have been brought into the country by American citizens, in defiance of the law which stigmatizes such traffic as piracy, and of treaties with foreign powers, and the unfortunate victims of this wickedness have been sold and, with their posterity, consigned to perpetual bondage. This piratical, illegal and impious traffic is openly countenanced and encouraged by a portion of the citizens of some of the States of the Union. The perpetrators who were taken *flagrante delictu* have been acquitted on a jury trial; citizens of the United States are combining to reopen and carry on the foreign slave trade, and a party is forming favorable to the repeal of the law that attaches a death penalty to the crime, which law was founded upon the broadest principles of philanthropy, religion and humanity, and is in exact consonance with the Divine law.

"Your memorialists, as American citizens, and as Christians, feel impelled, in view of the crime and sin alluded to, and their disastrous effects upon their own country, as well as upon the missions established by them in Africa, earnestly and respectfully to entreat your Honorable Bodies to cause the law of the land against the foreign slave trade to be rigorously enforced, the honor of the nation to be preserved, and the country saved from the disgrace of renewing a traffic held in abhorrence by the civilized world, and from the displeasure of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. The cause of missions is dear to the hearts of the Christian people of this country; they look to the constituted authorities with much anxiety at the present crisis; they have a deep sense of the solemnity of the obligations which treaties, superadded to the claims of natural justice, have imposed on the government of their country; and they justly apprehend the continued displeasure of the Great Ruler of nations, if a traffic so abhorred of God and man is suffered to exist. It is their prayer, and the prayer of your memorialists, that the blessings of Almighty God may rest upon the Congress of the United States, and that He will so enlighten the minds, and guide the deliberations, of those who are called into the councils of the nation that the faith and honor of the people and their government shall be preserved, all portions of their fellow-citizens saved from the guilt of piratical depredations upon the unoffending inhabitants of a distant continent, and that the judgments of an incensed God may be averted from their beloved land.

"And as in duty bound will ever pray."

This Memorial, it will be seen, was intended for adoption by the Board itself, and to be presented in its name to Congress. Dr. Cheever supported the proposition in a strong speech, of which we have nowhere seen a full report. A strong effort was made to silence him by pronouncing him out of order, but the Chairman, Judge Jessup, of Pa., defeated it by his impartial ruling, and he went on, in spite of various interruptions, till he finished all he had to say. We copy from the *New York Observer*.

Dr. C. said he was prompted to offer this memorial for four reasons: 1. The slave trade was the great obstacle in the way of missionary effort. 2. The progress of this trade was, at the present time, greater than ever. 3. An effort is being made to repeal the salutary laws now existing in relation to the horrible traffic; and 4. This memorial presented a legitimate and proper channel through which the Board might reach the halls of national legislation. In support of these propositions, he read a long argument against the slave trade, and on the subject of slavery in general, quoting from the letter of a missionary in Africa who speaks of the obstacles which the traffic opposes to missionary operations. He quoted also from Harper's Encyclopedia of Commerce the statement that in New York, Boston and Baltimore, 36 vessels are fitted out for this traffic every year (12 in each city), and 40 in all the country. The expenses of these vessels, he said, are $3,000,000. The receipts from the sale of slaves $20,000,000, and the profits $17,000,000. Mr. Douglas has stated that there were landed in the United States, last year, 14,000 Africans. He quoted from Southern writers who advocate the slave trade, some on the ground of it being a great missionary institution.

[Dr. Cheever was interrupted by several who wished to arrest the argument, and refer the memorial to a Committee, but he proceeded.]

He said it was objected to by many that the American Board is not an anti-slavery society. Neither is it a tem

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1859.

CORRESPONDENTS will greatly oblige us by a careful observance of the following directions, viz.:

Letters enclosing matter for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed "*Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business of the office, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the Anti Slavery Standard, No. 5 Beekman street, New York.*"

POSTPONED.—We are reluctantly compelled to postpone a letter from Mrs. Martineau—also a letter from Paris—to make room for the report of the Virginia Slave Insurrection.

THE AMERICAN BOARD.

THE movement commenced and carried on by the Abolitionists against slavery, advancing with slow but inevitable force, and testing the integrity of all men and all institutions, has shown the supporters of slavery in every department that they can no longer occupy their old ground with safety; that they *must* move from that position, or be removed. The two institutions most thoroughly representative in the whole country of the pro-slavery character of American piety have just illustrated this truth. The American Tract Society, refusing to yield an inch to the demands made upon her by Christian philanthropy, finds rival movements made, both in the East and in the West, which will soon diminish her revenues, and which have already taken away her credit and the *prestige* of her position. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, warned by this catastrophe of their own approaching doom, have now, for the first time, begun to give way. They show no signs of repentance; their movement is not made in such a manner as to entitle them to the least credit, or to give the least hope that they are disposed to relieve their "neighbor" who lies wounded and bleeding on the other side. Their huge and ponderous bulk moves only as the Great Eastern moved into the Thames, crowded, shoved, compelled, inch after inch, by the irresistible force of the hydraulic rams. But they have *begun* to move; they see the absolute necessity of some change, of taking some position which they can call a better position; and our part is, by continuing the demand that they shall come fully up to the requisitions of Christian duty, to strengthen the influence which thus constrains them.

The American Board has held its Fiftieth Annual Meeting (a "four days' meeting," commencing Oct. 4th) in the city of Philadelphia. There were present seventy-one of its two hundred and five corporate or voting members. Only six of these corporate members are from slave States, though many more may be slaveholders. This small proportion of Southern men shows how entirely pro-slavery the position of the Board is, and has always been, owing to the pro-slavery character of Northern church-members. The *New York Observer* contains an ample report of the proceedings of this meeting, and we shall make from it an abstract of such of those proceedings as relate to the connection of the Board with slavery.

As to the financial condition of this Association, it expends more than a thousand dollars a day, but receives less than that, and has now a debt of sixty-six thousand dollars. Rev. Dr. S. L. Pomroy, one of the Secretaries, advised the Board to disregard this debt, and to increase, instead of diminishing, their expenditure. It will be remembered that this man is the apostate abolitionist who, in his late tour in England, falsely represented the Board as "now" holding an anti-slavery position.

Rev. John Waddington, of London *(who is soliciting money from the Churches in this country)*, was invited to address the Board. He referred to Dr. Pomroy's visit to London, but said nothing of his false representations above mentioned, nor of their exposure by the vigilance of the Leeds "Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society." He said he was a friend of the slave, and would be ashamed of himself and his country if he did not make this testimony public. But instead of making his pretended friendship for the slave effective, by calling upon the Board to cease from the admission of slaveholders to their Churches, he proceeded to say that "his *policy*, however, as a friend to the mission work," was to go thoroughly into it "without any side issues to distract or disturb." He proceeded to censure one of the faults of the American people, namely, the wearing of jewelry(!), but said not another word about slavery, and left the impression of his entire unanimity, in feeling and action, with the Board. We trust the English Abolitionists will hold him to a strict account for this on his return. That platform was the very spot, above all others in this country, where he could have opposed slavery most effectively. His barren "profession" of friendship for the slave is an insult added to the injury of glancing at his cause as a matter to be disregarded in comparison with the missionary work. Dr. Waddington has fraternized with the pro-slavery clergy through his whole course in this country.

It will be remembered that the Board has allowed the admission of slaveholders to its Churches among the Choctaw Indians, and also among the Cherokee Indians, ever since the establishment of those missions, in spite of repeated remonstrances from those of its contributors who are opposed to slavery.

The Report of the Prudential Committee just presented announces that one of these slaveholding missions, that to the Choctaw nation, has now been discontinued, and its connection with the Board dissolved. The acquiescence of the Board in the slaveholding of its church-members there, and their recognition of a system as Christian which had deliberately and persistently baptized slaveholding with the Christian name (although they now discontinue this mission to get rid of troublesome complaints), are shown by the following extract from their Report:

"In closing our labors among the Choctaws, we have the satisfaction of reflecting that a work of permanent value has been accomplished in their behalf. Whatever may be said of other attempts to Christianize the aborigines of our country, there has been *no failure here*."

That portion of the Prudential Committee's Report which related to the slaveholding missions was referred to the following Committee: Rev. Albert Barnes, Dr. Sweetzer, Dr. Chickering, Dr. Fisher, S. H. Perkins, Esq., Hon. L. Child, O. E. Wood, Esq. The Board then adjourned to attend the "business men's prayer-meeting."

On the third day, after three-quarters of an hour had been spent in devotional exercises, and the "Committee on Devotional Exercises" had reported the programme for the communion services in the afternoon, Rev. George B. Cheever, D.D., presented for the consideration of the Board a memorial to Congress on the African slave trade. This document, with a slight sketch of Dr. Cheever's energetic and admirable speech in favor of it (which was finished in spite of repeated attempts to interrupt him), will be found in another part of this paper.

A debate then arose as to what should be done with the Memorial.

Rev. Dr. Anderson, the Senior Secretary, was not prepared to recommend that the Board should address Congress. If this were done, "a memorial should be drawn up containing no expression that would be objectionable to any member of this Board." He thought the best way would be to refer the whole matter to a committee, to be reported on *next year*. This recommendation of doing nothing now, and doing nothing at all until perfect unanimity is obtained in the Board, shows pretty clearly Dr. Anderson's position in regard to slavery. Dr. Nehemiah Adams was, that very evening, reëlected a member of that Board, and his South-side book expressly suggested the expediency of reöpening the foreign slave trade. As long as he remains upon the Board, even if there were no actual slaveholders associated with him, there can be no unanimous action against the slave trade.

Many members of the Board spoke upon the subject, "but the general opinion expressed was that it was not wise to act upon it at the present time"! The memorial (with these suggestions as to the wish of the Board) was then referred to the Business Committee.

After celebrating the Lord's Supper in two churches in the afternoon, the Board met in the evening and re-elected the old pro-slavery Officers, including South-side Adams, after which Rev. Albert Barnes, chairman of the Committee on the South-Western Indians, presented a Report from the majority of that Committee, intimating that the discontinuance of the Choctaw mission seemed premature, especially when it was proposed "solely on the ground of a difference of opinion between the missionaries of this Board in respect to the manner of preaching the Gospel, or the application of its principles to the evil of slavery." This Report recommended that the whole subject be referred to a special committee, to report next year, and meantime that the mission receive the usual support.

Hon. Linus Child, on behalf of himself and one other member of the Committee presented a minority Report, to the following effect: that the missionaries among the Choctaws [who have constantly insisted on the reception of slaveholders into their Churches] are devoted and faithful men, whose labors have been blessed of God to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the Choctaw nation, and for whom the Board entertain feelings of the highest respect, confidence and affection; that, nevertheless, "the termination of their connection will greatly relieve the Board of the serious and painful embarrassments to which it has been subjected"; and that, regretting the necessity of this movement, the Committee recommend that the Board concur in it, and that they also present to these missionaries the usual amount of a year's expenses.

Mr. Child, after reading the minority report, said he "wished to give the precise state of the question," and thereupon proceeded to an elaborate statement which he represented as a history of the case. The gentleman who followed on the other side said he "did not accept" that statement; and therein he did well, for it was (like most of the documents of the Board, and the representations of its functionaries in past times upon the subject) a labyrinth of error, consisting partly of omission of material facts, partly of misrepresentations, and partly of false statements. So enormous, and so abundant, have been the perversions of truth in the official documents of the Board, its Committees and its Secretaries, that it would take two pages of this paper to display the principal ones, with the evidence of them. But the general key to the whole of them is found in the following statement.

The Choctaw missionaries have pursued, from the first, a consistently pro-slavery course, having taken, in 1848, a position embodying the following points in substance.

1. That slaveholding was authorized by the New Testament.

2. That, therefore, they were fully determined not to make slaveholding a ground either for the expulsion of a church-member or the rejection of a candidate.

3. That they would not exercise discipline in the Church, either against the general buying and selling of slaves or the sale of children away from their parents.

4. That they would not adopt any train of measures which should even tend "in the end" to overthrow slavery.

The Prudential Committee seem to have been, from the first, entirely indifferent in regard to slavery, allowing the missionaries to receive slaveholders into their Churches, and making no remonstrance until remonstrances had repeatedly come to them from contributors to their funds, urging action on their part.

When, however, the difficulty arising from a diametrical opposition between the policy of their missionaries on one side and the wishes of some of their contributors on the other increased from year to year, some action on their part became indispensable; and this action was the issuing of documents, some of them long and elaborate, containing, invariably, two elements, which they hoped would content both parties; for the remonstrants, a great deal of pious talk, speaking unfavorably of slavery; and for the missionaries, in the same document, the allowance that slaveholders might still be received into their Churches. Mr. Child's statement commences with the mention of one of these Reports, made in 1845, by Dr. Leonard Woods, of Andover, of which he says that it "met the approbation of the Choctaw mission." Of course it did, since it decided the question in their favor, *expressly approving the admission of slaveholders to the Mission Churches*. The remonstrants continued to send memorials to the Board, and the Board would complacently refer them to a Committee *to report next year*, and the Report, when it appeared, would talk piously against slavery, *and allow the admission of slaveholders to the Churches*. The history of these transactions would be a constant series of repetitions of these movements. But, by and by, the Choctaw missionaries felt obliged to protest against the dishonesty of these Reports of the Board and its Prudential Committee, which, constantly deciding the matter in their favor, nevertheless constantly talked as if the other party, the remonstrants, were right. The Prudential Committee continued its attempts to trim between the two parties, trying to satisfy both, and actually satisfying neither, and finally the Choctaw missionaries determined to test the matter by sending in their resignation, in November, 1855. The Prudential Committee, having really no objection to the position and course of policy of the missionaries, desired them to recall their letter of resignation. We will quote from the *Observer's* report of Mr. Child's speech his account of the conclusion of this transaction, for the purpose of proving its falsity, and giving some specimens of the truth of our general allegation respecting the speech. Mr. Child says:

"The Prudential Committee wrote a reply dated Nov. 13, 1855, requesting them to reconsider their resignation. They replied, proposing certain conditions on which they would withdraw their resignation. These conditions were that the Board should *withdraw all their past action on the subject of slavery*, and leave the missionaries to act in regard to it according to their enlightened judgment, and the principles of the Word of God. *It was impossible for a moment to entertain this proposition.*"

It would have been absurd for the missionaries to stipulate that the Board should withdraw all its past action on the subject of slavery, because, although its *talk* had leaned in a different direction, all its *action* had been in their favor. They made no such proposition. What they *did* propose, and the *assent* which the Board gave to their proposition, may be seen in the following extract from their letter, under date of "Lenox, Choctaw Nation, Sept. 6th, 1856" (the whole of which is given in the *Observer* of Dec. 2d, 1858), and in the report of its result given in that paper, which agrees with the statement in the Annual Report of the Board for 1856.

After rehearsing their pro-slavery ground, the substance of which is above given, the missionaries say—

"If, *with the foregoing views—which are known by the people among whom we labor*—the Prudential Committee should deem it wise to continue our support, we are willing to try to remain in their service. Accordingly, we have estimated our expenses for the ensuing year. If, on the other hand, the Committee should not think it best to retain us, we shall not expect them to grant us the estimates."

The *Observer* gives the signatures to this document as follows:

C. KINGSBURY,	C. C. COPELAND,
C. BYINGTON,	O. P. STARK,
E. HOTCHKIN,	J. EDWARDS,

and it adds:

"The Prudential Committee took the subject into consideration, and, *with this letter before them, made the usual appropriations.* The missionaries, being thus left at liberty to pursue their work in their own way, have continued to prosecute their labors with their usual success."

The object of the missionaries in offering this resignation, and making the public declaration that they would continue in office only on the distinct understanding that they might continue to admit slaveholders to their Churches *as they had hitherto done*, was, obviously, to compel the whiffling, shuffling, time-serving Board to eat one set or the other of their self-contradictory words, and openly to declare which had been their real meaning in their long series of documents—the anti-slavery talk, or the pro-slavery action. Even in this, the missionaries spared the feelings of the Board far more than the latter deserved, and allowed them to show their decision quietly, by action, instead of a verbal acknowledgment of their hypocrisy. They said—*We shall continue to act as we have always done, and as you have always allowed us to do; if you make the usual appropriations, we shall understand that you wish us to stay* ON THOSE TERMS! The Board succumbed, and made the appropriations.

We now return to the meeting, though another episode will presently be necessary, to give proof, out of the mouths of functionaries of the Board, of the violations of truth and fair dealing which they so constantly practice.

After statements had been made by two gentlemen, one defending the report of the Committee and the other the minority report, Rev. Dr. Rufus Anderson, the Senior Secretary, spoke. He said (referring to the first of these reports)—

"It is not simply a matter of opinion, as stated, about which we differ. There are found to be great difficulties in carrying on this mission. *Positive instructions have been given to the missionaries, which they have disregarded.*"

Now, if Dr. Anderson's statement, here italicised, be true, the statement of the Prudential Committee, in their Annual Report for 1849, respecting the correspondence on slavery with these very missionaries, is false. It is as follows, expressly shielding the missionaries from the charge of disobedience to "positive instructions." The italics are those of the Report.

"The letter sent by Mr. Treat to the mission had not that authoritative character which some have attributed to it. It expressed *opinions*, then and still entertained by the Committee; but not in a form which made those opinions *decisions*, or *instructions*. The Committee have given no *instructions* to the missionaries in relation to slavery; they say expressly that they address their brethren '*with suggestions and arguments.*' The distinction between suggestions, opinions and arguments, on the one hand, and decisions, rules and instructions on the other, though necessarily familiar to the conductors of missions, seems to have been overlooked by some who have written on this subject."—p. 72.

* * * * * *

"This distinction is vital to the proper understanding of Mr. Treat's letter to the Choctaw mission; and for want of attention to it, very erroneous constructions have been put upon that letter. With this practical distinction in view, moreover, it will be seen that the Committee and the Secretaries have done nothing inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the two fundamental principles recognized by the Board at Brooklyn; namely, that credible evidence of piety is the only thing to be required for admission into the Churches gathered among the heathen; and that missionaries and their Churches are the rightful and exclusive judges as to the sufficiency of this evidence."—Ib.

A proverb tells us that liars have need of good memories. The Board seem not to have good memories, for they adopted, in 1854, the following resolution (reported by a committee of which Dr. Leonard Bacon was a member, and to be found on p. 24 of the Annual Report for that year) directly contradicting their own statement above.

"Resolved, That the Board acknowledge, with gratitude to God, the *wisdom and fidelity* with which, so far as appears from the documents submitted to them, the Prudential Committee are advising AND DIRECTING the missionaries among the Choctaws, in conformity with the principles asserted by them in their correspondence with those missions, reported to the Board in 1848."

We now resume the abstract of proceedings in the present meeting.

Rev. Dr. Cheever proposed the following substitute for the majority and minority reports, saying that the *sinfulness* of slaveholding was *the* great question. He was opposed to giving up this mission. He wished the Board to hold on to it, and to put away slavery from the Churches connected with it. His substitute was—

"That in the opinion of the Board the holding of slaves should be pronounced an immorality, inconsistent with membership in any Christian Church, and that it should be required that these Missionary Churches should immediately put away from them this sin, and should cease to sanction it even in appearance."

Dr. Leonard Bacon strongly objected to this substitute, deprecated agitation in the most earnest manner, severely condemned the missionaries, and wished the matter decided now.

Dr. Cheever's substitute was laid on the table "*by a unanimous vote.*"

Rev. Dr. Patton moved to lay both Reports on the table, which was done.

The discussion was continued with energy; a motion to adjourn, "as it was then past midnight," was lost; finally, Mr. Child moved that the Report of the Prudential Committee on this subject (discontinuing the Choctaw mission) be *approved, adopted* and ordered to be printed. This motion *was carried*, and the adjournment of the third day was made at a quarter before one o'clock on the morning of the fourth day.

On the fourth day, after the meeting had been "opened with prayer," the Business Committee, to which had been referred the Memorial of Rev. Dr. Cheever, on the subject of the Slave Trade, made the following Report:

"While the Board regard with sentiments of unqualified condemnation the African slave trade, and cannot but feel the liveliest regard and alarm at the disposition manifested in this and other countries to revive it, in one form or another, especially in view of the fact that it is interfering and is likely to interfere, in the most serious manner, with the proper missionary work of the Board; yet, inasmuch as there is not sufficient time, at this advanced stage of the meeting, properly to deliberate and determine upon the course proper to be pursued in so great a matter; therefore,

"Resolved, That the whole subject, with the memorial that brings it before the body, be referred to the Prudential Committee, and that they take such action as in their judgment its relation to their work as a Board of Missions shall seem to demand."

This resolution was *adopted, without discussion;* and thus we find again successfully repeated the old trick of securing delay and perhaps entire escape from a troublesome subject, by reference to the Prudential Committee.

The last action of the Board was a unanimous vote that the Prudential Committee make arrangements annually for a delegation to the General Assembly of the (pro-slavery) Presbyterian Church.

One class of religious newspapers (so-called), of which *The Observer* is a type, regret the discontinuance of the Choctaw mission, on the ground that the Board ought not to notice complaints respecting a practice so unobjectionable (or, if it be in some degree objectionable, so trivial) as slaveholding. Another class, represented by *The Independent* of this city and *The Congregationalist* of Boston, which have made a great parade of objection to the pro-slavery position of the Tract Society, now congratulate their readers upon the discontinuance of the Choctaw mission, representing that it sets the Board right in regard to slavery. What shall be said of the honesty of this last class, which say not a word to their readers of the equally pro-slavery character of the Cherokee mission, which is continued by the Board without objection or remonstrance? They know very well that the Cherokee missionaries have always maintained, *and are still maintaining*, the policy announced in their letter of 1848, signed by Elizur Butler, *Moderator*, and S. A. Worcester, *Clerk*, as follows:

"In regard to the question of rejecting any person from the church *simply* because he is a *slaveholder*, we cannot for a moment hesitate. For (1) we regard it as *certain* that *the Apostles, who are our patterns, did receive slaveholders to the communion of the Church*; and we have not yet been able to perceive any such difference between their circumstances and ours as to justify us in departing from their practice in this respect. And (2) our general rule is to receive all to our communion who give evidence that they love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; and we cannot doubt that *many slaveholders do give such evidence.*

"Nor can we even make it a test of piety, or a condition of admission to the privileges of the Church, that a candidate *should express a determination not to live and die a slaveholder.*"—39th annual Report, 1848, p. 93.

"*Occasional* exchanges of masters are so *inseparable from the existence of slavery* that the churches could not consistently receive slaveholders to their communion at all, and *at the same time forbid all such exchanges.* We regard it, therefore, as IMPOSSIBLE TO EXERCISE DISCIPLINE FOR THE BUYING OR SELLING OF SLAVES, except in flagrant cases of manifest disregard to the welfare of the slave."—p. 94.

"In regard to the separation of parents and children, we must first remark, that it is one of those things which are not forbidden by any *express* INJUNCTION OF SCRIPTURE."

* * * "It is impossible, in our circumstances, to make it a general rule that the separation of parents and children, by sale or purchase, shall be regarded as a disciplinable offence."—pp. 94, 95.

In conclusion, we beg our readers—and especially the *English* readers of THE STANDARD—to remark that the Board have shown their pro-slavery character in these four ways, in the important session which has just closed:

1. By their unanimous refusal to adopt Dr. Cheever's resolution declaring slaveholding an immorality, incompatible with membership in a Christian Church.

2. By their evasion of Dr. Cheever's Memorial against the Slave Trade.

3. By their continued license to the slaveholding Churches and the pro-slavery missionaries of the Cherokee mission.

4. By their continued neglect to enforce measures of Christain reform upon the Choctaw mission, and by their avowed motive in ultimately discontinuing that mission, namely, not to get rid of sin, but to get rid of trouble!

THE PENNSYLVANIA ANNIVERSARY.

SPEECH OF MARY GREW.

[Miss Grew spoke on Wednesday evening. This report, though not complete, will be found correct as far as it goes.]

THIRTY years have elapsed since the voice of a prophet of God rang out on the air, calling this nation to repentance, and demanding the emancipation of every American slave. Thirty years! During that period a generation has passed away, while the great conflict then commenced has been earnestly carried on. At this point of time a natural and interesting question is, What has been accomplished? What has been won? Looking back to the commencement of this period, we see the nation slumbering over this great fact of slavery. Of those who were startled by the prophet's voice, some responded in anger, some in scorn, and a few gathered around his uplifted banner, and pledged themselves to work with him for the abolition of American slavery. Little did they then conceive of the greatness of the work before them; little did they foresee that it would extend through all these years. They saw that they stood alone, opposed by mighty forces—but they believed that the Church, as soon as her attention should be directed to the subject, would respond to their call, and come to their help. And none among them looked more confidently to the American Church for such aid than did he who commenced this warfare. Some persons seem to suppose that the early Abolitionists meditated a fierce onslaught on the Church. So far from this, they expected it to be found on the side of the slave. They were in the Church, and of it; pastors, deacons, elders, devout men and women, whose most sacred associations clustered around it. They knew it by the dear names of the Church of God, the Church of Christ, and they believed it would be faithful to humanity. Oh! cold critic of to-day, standing, a calm spectator, outside of this great battle-field, censuring the harshness of Abolitionists towards the Church, little do you know the tenacity of the grasp with which they clung to it, or the pain with which they discovered that it was on the side of the oppressor; little do you know with what grief they learned the full meaning of those bitter words, "If it had been an enemy, then could I have borne it, but it was thou, my own familiar friend, my spiritual guide, my acquaintance, with whom I took sweet counsel, and walked to the house of God in company." The fathers and mothers of our Israel, who have led our enterprise from that hour to this, and their younger coadjutors who have unfalteringly toiled by their side, can testify that it was not until the American Church fully revealed herself as in league with oppression, not until it was clearly seen that slavery nestled under her altars, and was consecrated by her most sacred rites, while to the expostulations and entreaties of the friends of the slave she gave, for all reply, anger, scorn, and excommunication, that the Abolitionists shook off the dust of their feet against her, and lifted up the cry, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partaker in her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

Is this the whole answer to our question, What has been accomplished? Have we nothing to show but the work of an Ithuriel's spear? A comparison of the past with the present condition of our country reveals a degree of progress sufficient to encourage the most desponding heart, and to strengthen the weakest hands. Thirty years ago the nation was silent on this subject; it might almost be said that no man cared for the slave. Now there is not a legislative body in the land in which it is not an exciting topic of discussion. It has entered into all our large ecclesiastical organizations; it is debated in our lyceums, in our streets, and by our firesides. It has divided the Methodist Church; and though the Methodist Church, North, can, perhaps, claim no great merit on the ground of anti-slavery character and action, it is something that she was willing, even, to decree that her Bishops should not be slaveholders. It has thoroughly disturbed the guilty peace of the Presbyterian and Baptist Churches, and, at last, has forced its entrance into that stronghold of conservatism, the New York Episcopal Convention. It is the one great question of our political parties, those parties which once scorned to notice it. Our movement has created a large political party; and though, perhaps, we are not very proud of this work of our hands, when we consider the low type of its anti-slavery character, still it is most important and valuable as an evidence of progress.

But an arduous work is still before us; the work of carrying on the half-finished moral education of this people, until the emancipation of four millions of slaves shall be accomplished. What are you going to do respecting it? Are you sitting still, with folded hands, waiting to see what the Abolitionists will do? Is there any greater responsibility resting upon them than on yourselves to do this work? It is *your* country which is to be redeemed from this great sin. Oh! minister, lawyer, merchant, mechanic, farmer—oh! father, mother, husband, wife—has the slave any stronger claim upon us than he has upon you? The slave is a man, and has a man's claim on you for sympathy and succor. The slave is a father, mother, husband, wife, and as such appeals to you for help. What does the Abolitionist owe to him which you do not? In his name we ask you to come to his help, and so to labor in his behalf that of each of you it shall one day be said, For the emancipation of millions of slaves, for the redemption of thy country, for the bringing of the world into harmony with God, thou hast done what thou couldst.

SPEECH OF REV. O. B. FROTHINGHAM.

MR. FROTHINGHAM said that, as in concerts of music it was arranged that the more solid classical pieces should be alternated with lighter and more popular ones, the Sonata or the Symphony being succeeded by the glee or ballad, so here it was fitting that after the weightier speech should come the simpler speeches. Mr. Burleigh had delivered his grave argument on the Constitution; he would therefore throw in his less imposing strain of sentiment. For his part, he never could take much interest in the constitutional or political aspects of this great question. He cared very little how men interpreted the Constitution of the United States—whether they regarded it as a pro-slavery or as an anti-slavery document; he knew little about party principles, party platforms, or party men; it seemed to him of secondary importance what theory one held about the Union, or what view one took of the past history of the country in regard to the institution of slavery. One undeniable fact was enough for him—a fact open to every man's daily knowledge, and staring every man continually in the face—the fact that the *humanity of a whole race was practically and theoretically denied* by the people of the country. Millions of creatures in the human form, whom God seemed to have made in his own image, whom he had endowed with the richest affections, the sweetest dispositions, the most touching and winning traits of character, a moral sense uncommonly sensitive, and a religious sensibility remarkably deep and quick, were reckoned not to be men and women at all, but only a higher kind of animal. Love in them was not human love; goodness in them was not human goodness. Their courage, their fortitude, their love of life and liberty, their fidelity to their husbands, wives, children, did not deserve the same meed of respect which was paid to the same virtues in the stronger race. This fact was more impressive than all others; if fairly grasped and appreciated in all its issues, it rendered everything else insignificant. Whoever was fully possessed of this fact might well be indifferent to merely constitutional or political questions.

This fact, said Mr. F., reveals in our people a radical defect, *an utter want of power to appreciate true moral heroism.* We hear a great deal said about modern chivalry, modern heroism; and certainly, so far as it goes, it is all well and worthily said; but the chivalry so much admired is chiefly displayed in the cause of industrial enterprise, commercial progress and scientific daring; the heroism so much lauded is the heroism displayed by white people in the great material undertakings that are characteristic of the age. The modern hero is the man who stands at his post in his shop, at his office, on his deck, and sacrifices himself for money, or fame, or power, or the discharge of duties from which he could not retire without dishonor. Let us not neglect to honor virtue under any form. Let us pay all respect due to fortitude, perseverance, patience, bravery and self-surrender in any cause interesting to civilization. But here are thousands of men and women yearly exhibiting a heroism which makes all this look dim and paltry, and it receives no honor, scarcely anything better than contempt. Mr. F. then dwelt upon the dangers encountered and the sufferings borne by fugitive slaves—their hunger, thirst and nakedness, their nights and days in the woods, their long and weary marches, solitary, tired, and with bleeding feet, their stowing away of themselves in ships, hiding of themselves in boxes; he told the story of the man recently found dead from suffocation, with his food within reach of his hand, and said that people who could read such accounts without a thrill of pride and admiration, without a deep indignation against the national sentiments which condemned an abject race to such perils and sorrows, was incapable of appreciating real heroism in man and woman. How, asked Mr. F., should these fugitives be received as they come, at the average rate of one every day, to the Anti-Slavery office in New York, all but exhausted with fatigue and fear? They should be welcomed as white people would be welcomed in the same case, as fugitives from Algerine bondage would be welcomed. There should be committees of influential persons charged with the duty of taking care of them; there should be dépôts of clothing and provisions, arrangements for keeping them unmolested and furnishing them with gainful and honest occupation. How *are* they received? A secretary, out of very scanty means, supplies them with the absolute necessaries of existence, a conspicuous item of which is a ticket to the dominions of Queen Victoria, by the earliest train. Free States shut their doors against them. Freemen in Missouri would banish them from her limits. Freemen in Kansas would hold them disfranchised. Indiana has its black laws, Illinois has its black laws, Ohio has had them, Connecticut has had them. The Fugitive Slave law reaches them over nearly the whole Northern country, and there is scarcely a spot from which they cannot be taken and may not be taken by the myrmidons of the government. They live, where they are allowed to live at all, in perpetual fear and under general disability. They are a Pariah caste, condemned to menial employments and to social obscurity. In Philadelphia, a black man may not drive an omnibus; in New York, a black man may ride only in certain cars, marked "For Colored People." In Maryland, there is one free black to every six inhabitants. In Louisiana, there is one to every fifteen. Virginia has one to sixteen and a half; South Carolina has one to thirty; Pennsylvania has one to forty-two; New York, one to sixty-two. But the proportion in Maine and Vermont is but one to four hundred and forty-seven, while in New Hampshire it is only one to six hundred and thirty-four. Is it climate that causes this difference? No: for they go to Canada, and live there. There they multiply and enjoy existence. It is prejudice; prejudice of the strong against the weak, the wealthy against the poor, the white against the black, the born freeman against the born slave, the national ruler against the national serf. There was a condition of things that ought to stir to its depths the conscience of any Christian nation, and make possible, nay, just and good, any amount of disregard of laws in behalf of humanity. Mr. F. doubted the possibility of getting a Personal Liberty bill in New York or Pennsylvania, but said that the agitation about it would at least make the people familiar with the discussion of the question in its most radical aspects, would help to break the charm which now protects everything in the shape of law, and dispel the superstition which shelters bad legislation from the assaults of a righteous conscience. This agitation would keep the moral issues of the matter open—would keep quick the humane sympathies of the people—would deepen the sense of national dishonor, and awaken a more profound and general resolve to put away slavery itself as an institution abhorrent both to man and God.

REMARKS OF REV. W. H. FURNESS.

Like our friend, Mr. Frothingham, I came here not to give, but to receive. I do not well know how to make a speech, and do not much care to know, as I find that speeches can be made, and able speeches too, as the profession of the Law shows, on any side of any question. The great thing is to be on the right side. And I come here with gladness, to stand by these strong people. The Abolitionists, though but a handful, are they not strong? Have they not laid a giant's grasp on this great nation and compelled it to listen to them, chaining the public attention to the hated subject of Human Rights, and so strongly that every struggle the nation makes to get rid of it has ended only in bringing it to confront more directly the thing it hates, so that now it is settled that the great question must be decided one way or the other, for freedom or for slavery?

Mr. Frothingham spoke of the heroism of the despised and oppressed race, and he gave us the worldly, commercial idea of heroism, and mentioned, as its chief trait, the ability to make money. Even in this respect, the African may compete with the Saxon, the slave with his master, on his master's own ground. A man came to me from the South, the other day, who, with his own earnings, had purchased his family for $3,600 and himself for $2,800, paying for himself twice over on account of some alleged informality in the first bargain. Where, among the noisy herd of our political demagogues, shall we look for heroism like this? A friend present at the time and place once told me of a man who, having just been sold to go South, instantly laid his hand on a block and chopt it off to save himself from that fate. We must turn to the records of ancient Roman heroism to parallel this. But it is not for the sake of the heroes alone among the oppressed that our heartiest sympathies belong to the cause of abolition. The poor dumb, crushed slaves, who have no strength left in them to do and to dare, for these should we pray and labor; for it is inexpressibly base for the strong to trample on the weak.

AN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY IN KENTUCKY.

CINCINNATI, Oct. 1, 1859.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

DEAR SIR: Believing that you take a deep interest in every movement calculated to ameliorate the condition of the slave, I take this means of informing you of an Anti-Slavery Society, of which some of your readers may be ignorant.

This Association has been organized in Newport, Ky., and quite a number have enrolled their names on its books.

I have just returned from one of their monthly meetings. It was a cheering assemblage of honest, upright citizens—a convention of American yeomanry, whose independence has never paid homage to the Slave Power. The President of the Association, Mr. Abner Williams, is a *man* of the true stamp. Though not a graduate of any college, he displays a native talent and energy surpassed by few. He is a massive, rough-hewn pillar in the Association. Nor would we forget Mr. Bailey, editor of *The Free South*, a self-sacrificing and earnest friend of the cause. Their time was chiefly occupied in discussing plans of uniting all kindred Societies in Kentucky, and forming a State organization. Bold sentiments were uttered, such as I never expected to hear on slave soil. They avowed a determination to support the Republican nominee for the Presidency; but in their State policy, Emancipation will be their end and aim. They have taken a lofty stand, and inaugurated a movement which is bound to be felt throughout Kentucky. This is an advance in the right direction. It is peculiarly fit that the Southerners themselves should throw open the prison-house of the slave, and let the oppressed go free. All honor to the men of Newport and Covington! It required some nerve to plant the flag-staff of freedom in slave soil and fling its bright banner to the winds. Let this awaken the Abolitionists to a double diligence. Let the soldiers of freedom re-burnish their arms, relight their watch-fires, and rouse up their sleeping sentinels. Oh, that more enthusiasm could be infused into the Abolition ranks! Our cause is great and honorable, but its advocates are few. The "irrepressible conflict" ever rages, and often the black standards of oppression seem to float in triumph over the field. But a star is climbing up the western heavens; dark clouds veil its brightness, but we eagerly watch its course, for, like the Star of Bethlehem, it is a token of *salvation—salvation to the slave.*

Let us give our aid and sympathy to our brothers in Kentucky, and thus encourage them to move onward until their aim is accomplished and their State becomes as free as when Daniel Boone bounded over its broad, green hunting-grounds. Yours in the Cause, X.

WENDELL PHILLIPS'S LECTURE.

WE present to our readers, on the last page of this sheet, the revised speech of WENDELL PHILLIPS, at the recent opening of the Course of Fraternity Lectures in Boston. We might almost say that there could be but one intellectual pleasure greater than the reading of such an address, and that is to have heard it spoken. One such living speech is worth ten gilded orations—particularly such as that which recently fell dead

"at the foot of Pompey's statue."

It is one of the standing anecdotes of Mr. Webster (before he unhappily turned into bronze), narrated at every annual wine-drinking at the Astor House in honor of his memory, that, on a certain occasion, when he was asked, "Which of Shakspeare's plays he most admired?" he replied, "Always the one he *last had read.*" So we may say of Mr. Phillips's speeches (and we mean no disrespect in mentioning his name in such a connection!) that the one we last have read is always the best, except the one we last have heard, which is always better still.

If we could bring our minds to accept the doctrine of transmigration of souls, it would not be difficult to believe that Wendell Phillips must have been made up of the combined best parts of Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Philip Sidney—having all the courtly elegance of the one, all the philosophic spirit of the other, and all the courage of both. He knows how to utter (and no other man so well) *the word for the hour*—which must be uttered eloquently, to win a hearing, and bravely, for there are sure to be hisses to meet it!

Mr. Phillips's speech from the pulpit of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Church of Boston—so pointed, so eloquent, so timely—should have the immediate audience of the whole country from the wider platform of the newspaper and the tract.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CCLVI.

THE ARGUMENT.—The Correspondent giveth his last words on the Webster Statue—Mr. Phillips, the Duke of Norfolk and Mr. Webster—A jest well taken—The damage done to the Republican prestige by this concession—The attempt to cover their disgrace by Mr. Mann's Statue—The real animus of this movement—Why Mr. Webster hated Mr. Mann—In what can the Correspondent well subscribe—Legislative amendments touching the Mann Statue—Tribute to Mr. Capron and Mr. Philbrick, &c. &c. &c.

BOSTON, Oct. 17, 1859.

WHEN I wrote to you last, I had quantities more to tell you about the gentleman in sheet-iron trousers and a verdigris complexion, according to the lively sketch of the same given to Mr. N. P. Willis by Lieut. Wise, Mr. Everett's son-in-law, who looks down upon us from his particularly ugly perch (worthy of the load it bears, which seems to be toppling over from it) in the State House yard. But I am afraid that it has all vanished from my brain, along with the wooden amphitheatre from the court-yard, which left its turf damaged for the season. The Committee, however, have had the grace to sod over that part nearest the great and terrible image they have set up. It is hardly correct to say that he looks down upon us, as he holds his nose up in the air, for all the world as if he smelt something bad, and his face is turned towards the South, in accordance with the suggestion I myself made when the business was first ventilated. I should think that the members of the Great and General Court, who pass under his nose every day to earn their three dollars by squabbling over parts of speech, tenses and declensions, would see in the expression of his countenance how much the Statue despises them (the Republican part of them, at least), who put him there over their heads, however well it may like the position and promotion. Nobody had a keener relish for the *sauce piquante* of such humiliation than Mr. Webster in the flesh, and it is not to be supposed that enjoyment of its flavor can be any less in the bronze.

You recollect Mr. Phillips's admirable illustration of the relation of Mr. Webster's Retainers towards him when they stood by him through thick and thin (especially through *thick*), after the Seventh of March Speech. It will bear repetition, though few of your readers can have forgotten it. He said this action on the part of the Whig merchants, lawyers and ministers of Boston reminded him of what the tipsy Duke of Norfolk said once to a boon companion of his, whom he found dead-drunk in the kennel—or the gutter, as we should say in this country. His grace, you may remember, was a political and a bottle companion of Fox and Sheridan, in the good old days when three bottles of wine was thought a modest allowance for a sober man. He was reeling home from the tavern one night (for even Dukes used to haunt taverns sixty years since), and found one of his jolly friends prostrate in the mud. He was himself too far gone to assist him, so he said to him, "My dear fellow, I can't help you up, but I'll do the next best thing for you—*I'll lie down by your side!*" which he did. Well, there was no one in these United States that enjoyed the excellent felicity of this illustrative story more than Mr. Webster did. I have been assured, from the best authority, that when seated at table, after dinner, he would often call on one of his friends, who is a capital *raconteur*, for Wendell Phillips's story of the Duke of Norfolk, and was never tired of hearing and laughing at it. Of course

been a good many men, from John Winthrop to John Quincy Adams inclusive, that are quite as deserving of such a memorial as he, not to say a trifle more. In fact, the Mann statue, at least in that place, would never have been thought of had it not been for the Webster one. And if they would put on the pedestal of the first the inscription, "CAPTATOR VERBORUM!" I think I would give a five-dollar bill towards it myself. This feeling was also manifested in the House by one Mr. Brown, a Democratic member from Framingham, who moved, as an amendment to the resolve of permission, that it should not be placed in the position answering to that of Mr. Webster's statue! This was, of course, voted down; but a more ingenious one of Mr. Brimmer, of Boston, that it should not be set up unless approved by the Legislature, was carried. This requires another vote on the matter before the statue can be set up, and leaves the question open for another Legislature to act upon—possibly of a political complexion hostile to the measure. To be sure, it is hardly within the range of human possibilities that a worse statue than the one they have accepted could be offered to them.

I have several other things to say, but must leave them unsaid, at least for the present. But as so much of this letter has been given to the memory of two public men, it were unjust not to leave space for a word about two private men, of more consequence to many of your readers than either of them. Can you imagine an anti-slavery meeting without the benignant countenance of Effingham Capron beaming good-will upon upon it? Wise, benevolent, liberal of hand and of soul, cheerful and serene, the straight coat and broad brim of Quakerdom never graced a purer philanthropist or a more thorough gentleman. Samuel Philbrick was not so identified with the public meetings of the Abolitionists, as he was not so regular in his attendance upon them, as Mr. Capron, but he was even more an integral part of its secret councils. His management of the funds of the Massachusetts Society and of *The Liberator* has been of the most constant and important service to the cause for the last twenty years. A more just or a more clear-sighted man did not live. He was a rare instance of an American who knew when he had enough. Five and twenty years ago, he retired from business with an ample estate, and, unlike most retired merchants, he knew how to spend his time satisfactorily, without the excitements of trade. The care of his property, the improvement of his beautiful estate at Brookline, the prosperity of his family, and the great unselfish interest of the Anti-Slavery Movement, gave him happy occupation to the declining years of his life. He could be ill spared, and will be long missed. D. Y.

Our Washington Correspondence.

Senator Broderick—His Position—California—The Pacific Railroad—Organization of the House—Shall Plunder or Principle rule?—Mr. Douglas's Presidential prospects—Mr. Forney—Pious Mr. Cobb—an "incident" in his career, etc., etc.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Oct. 10, 1859.

THE news of Senator Broderick's murder creates a sensation in the Federal metropolis. You can get at once a fair idea of the hatred felt by orthodox Democrats for Broderick, and of popular religion here, if I retail a conversation I heard yesterday morning at the City Post-Office. Two or three gentlemanly-looking persons met in front of the Post-Office when one accosts his friend as follows:

"Great news from California—isn't there?"

"No—I don't know anything about it," replies the person addressed.

"Senator Broderick is dead—shot through the lungs!" says the first speaker.

"Broderick dead!" returns the second person, greatly elated; "d—n him, *I'm glad of it!*"

"A pretty speech for a member of the Fourth Presbyterian Church," put in the third person of the trio, who had not uttered a word till now. A "pretty" conversation, truly, was it not, for a Sunday morning in our metropolis, and the participants "pious and respectable" men?

Senator Broderick is dead. Killed by the Chief Justice of California! So long as such a fact is possible in California, anti-slavery cannot breathe on her soil. Many Republicans are disappointed by the result of the late election in the Golden State, but they need not have been. California is perhaps the most hopeless State in the Union. Lust for gold populated the State, and a lust for everything devilish characterizes most of her citizens. She is overrun by Southern lawyers and bankrupt slaveholders. It will take twenty years to give California an anti-slavery sentiment.

Mr. Broderick had fine points in his character, and some very bad ones. He was a singular man. He sprung, as you are aware, from the common people. His father was a stone-cutter—he himself followed the trade for some years and forced himself up out of his condition into the U. S. Senate. He was a lonely man—unmarried—and inclined to solitude. The conduct of Gwin and the Administration sickened him of the dominant party, and, to a great extent, of politics. During the past two winters in Washington the Slave Democracy have hated but feared him. It was known generally that few ties bound him to society, and he avowed his purpose to say and do as he pleased, and, if necessary, he should freely make use of murderous weapons for his protection. The consequence was that the chivalry gave him a wide berth. Once, when he was speaking, Slidell, of Louisiana, kept up a continual barking and scraping of his throat. Many present understood it to express his contempt for the speaker. Broderick turned mildly towards him, and said, "Some Senators have a habit of interrupting me when I speak, by loud coughing—*no gentleman* will be guilty of such a practice." Slidell kept silence after that. English, of Indiana, was severely reprimanded, a couple of winters ago, by Mr. B. In fact, Mr. Broderick expressed his opinions very freely of doughfaces and doughfaceism. It may not be generally known, but it is a fact, that he was not the warm political friend of Mr. Douglas. When he broke off from the orthodox party, he at first made friends with Mr. D., but he very soon distanced his Illinois friend, and found that popular sovereignty was a delusion. He *hated* the Slave Democracy—the slaveholding clique which rules the nation—and indeed slavery.

Had he lived, Senator Broderick would have grown into a radical anti-slavery man. As it was, he was a near friend of Mr. Seward's, and had the highest respect for the man and his position.

The faults of Mr. Broderick were nurtured in the hot-bed of the Tammany Democracy in New York. He was greatly injured by contact with the Democratic thieves and office-holders of New York and San Francisco. But in time he would have outgrown his vices and faults—we may hope.

After all, the attempt of Horace Greeley and others to patch up a union between the Broderick Democracy and the Republicans of California was a blunder. It has not availed, and now the Republicans must go back to a foundation principle and fight their way slowly up to success.

We shall have a new Senator from California, and he will be, if anything, worse than Gwin in his defence of slavery.

As for the Pacific Railroad—let it slide. What is the use in making such a pother over the matter, and taxing the free States to accomplish this great undertaking, when California herself clings to the South, which constantly opposes her darling project. For one humble individual, I am henceforth *opposed* to the Pacific Railroad to be built out of the public funds—till California herself cares enough about it to join hands with her friends.

But I have dwelt too long upon California and Senator Broderick. The news of Washington is not important, but I cannot close without speaking of one or two subjects.

It is very evident that the Republicans are going to be at the mercy of the South Americans and the Forney Democrats in the organization of the House. Now, if the organization can be made, as a matter of business, by giving a purely *business* office to some gentleman who is not a Republican, it may be well to save much of the contention by pursuing this course. But if the Republicans give an important office like that of the Speakership to a pro-slavery man, they deserve everlasting defeat. For one, I care not who reads the House Journal, or who keeps the doors of the House, but the presiding officer of that body, who makes up all its Committees, must, if he be elected by Republican votes, be an enemy of slavery. If he is not, Republicanism will disgrace itself.

The more I see in this region and the better acquainted I get with Southern newspapers, the more firmly convinced am I that Mr. Douglas cannot get the support of the South as a Presidential candidate. I learn that Mr. Forney declares that in that event, if the South refuses to take him up, *he* must and will. But if the South does adopt him, it will be at the expense of his principles, and in that event Mr. Forney will support the Republican candidate.

Mr. D. is a bad and dangerous man. If you doubt his ability to deceive and entangle, notice how many Republican papers already talk softly about his miserable squatter sovereignty sophistries. Eli Thayer takes up the Douglas idea and adopts it—and there are other Republicans in New England besides him who do it. The wonder to me is that these gentlemen remain in the Republican ranks; why not train under the captain whose tactics they like? He is certainly, personally, a stronger man before the people than any Republican leader.

There is no local news at present worth repeating. A revival is going on in some of our Churches, and the price of negroes is high. The permanent inhabitants of Washington are a steady, moral people—not fond of theatres—given greatly to church-going—and a little addicted to man-stealing. I was amused, in attending a Baptist church, the other Sunday, to see the pious fervor of Howell Cobb, Secretary of the Treasury. His fat sides fairly shook as he sang a pious hymn. It was a rare scene for the correspondent of *The New York Observer*. "Irænæus" would have insured the fat Secretary for heaven if he had seen what I saw. It was equal to Mr. Buchanan's meeting walk from Wheatland to the Lancaster church. Blessed saints—Buchanan and Cobb—when *will* they have done with earthly things, and go to their reward? ANON.

PERSONAL.

The report that Alfred Tennyson's health was impaired and that a trip across the Atlantic had been recomended as a remedy, is contradicted.

Ralph Waldo Emerson remarked, in a recent lecture, that our trust in physicians was not confidence in their skill, but despair of our own.

Rev. Dr. Lyman Beecher's autobiography is in preparation. The correspondenee in it embraces unique and entertaining letters from various scions of the renowned family of which he is the venerable head. It will be published in a few months.

John P. Nichol, Professor of Astronomy in the University of Glasgow, died, a few days since, at the hydropathical establishment at Rothesay, of congestion of the brain. His attainments in astronomical science were extensive, as various works from his pen abundantly prove. In the domain of moral science and philosophical investigation he also achieved a high reputation. He was an Abolitionist and a friend of the American Anti-Slavery Society. His second wife, formerly Elizabeth Pease of Darlington, survives him.

Rev. George Trask, the anti-tobacco preacher, succeeded in obtaining a hearing on his favorite theme at the late meeting of the A. B. C. F. M. The question, How to keep the Board free from debt? being up for discussion, he showed by a collection of statistics that enough tobacco was used by "evangelical Christians" in a single year to support five American Boards, and pay the expenses of every missionary family now on the field of labor.

The Paris coreespondent of *The Tribune*, in a letter received by the Africa, says:

"I passed a half hour with Mr. Charles Sumner yesterday. I have not seen him in such apparently firm health in three years. His own feelings and the opinions of Mr. Brown-Séquard confirm this appearance. If not fully restored to his normal state of health, he is at last fairly and far advanced on the road to it. Mr. Sumner proposes leaving here in a few days for England, whence he takes his departure, probably early in November, for the United States."

The Puritan Recorder (Boston), alluding to a recent sermon of the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, says:

"What we have, with sad forebodings, long expected is now realized, in Mr. Beecher's open abandonment of the doctrine of the inevitable and eternal perdition of ungodly men. The secret of his fraternizing with Chapin and Parker is now fully explained in his open avowal of the main principle of Universalism—which is that all the Scriptural assertions of the sure and eternal punishment of the wicked fail to make us know that they will thus be punished."

We call attention to the advertisement of Rev. E. G. Holland in another column. Mr. Holland is the pastor of the "Christian congregation" worshipping in Clinton Hall. Having spent some time in foreign countries, he is prepared to discuss themes somewhat out of the ordinary Lyceum routine. He is thoroughly acquainted especially with Literature, Life and Manners in Germany, on which subjects he lectured to wide acceptance in England, in 1857–8.

Rev. Antoinette Brown Blackwell will preach in Lyrique Hall, —— Broadway, to-morrow (Sunday) evening, and every Sunday evening thereafter until further notice. She hopes to found a free and unsectarian religious Society in this city—a Society that shall encourage the bravest criticism of the popular faith and morals, while it labors to apply the principles of Christianity to the practical questions of the age. Her congregation, we hope, will soon be found too numerous for the small hall in which she has chosen to commence her labors.

The Eastport (Me.) *Sentinel*, speaking of the lecture recently delivered in that town, at the Methodist Church, by Miss Holley, an agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, says that Miss Holley has a full and distinct yet womanly utterance; her manner is modest and unassuming, her language choice and appropriate. She is an effective speaker, as was evinced by the close attention of the large audience from the beginning to the close of the lecture. The house was full in every part, and large numbers were unable to gain admittance to the inside of the church.

Mr. Stephen Brewer, of Cortland, our readers will recollect, was lately excommunicated from the Presbyterian Church in that place upon a charge of Sabbath-breaking and neglect of Christian ordinances in going to hear lectures by Wendell Phillips, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Geo. W. Curtis and others. He appealed from the Session to the Presbytery, which confirmed the sentence, and then from the Presbytery to the Synod, which has just endorsed the decision of the subordinate tribunals, 22 to 11. The trial before the Synod was the occasion of much excitement. Perhaps some correspondent may think it worth while to furnish us with some account of it.

At the Music Hall, Boston, on Sunday last, at the close of a sermon, by the Rev. George Hepworth, on "The Church Demanded by the Times," in which the preacher criticized the late utterances of Dr. Bellows, a letter was read from Theodore Parker (so says the Boston *Journal*), announcing "that he is advised by the most competent physicians that he will never again be able to address a congregation, even should he, as he hopes, gain sufficient strength to enable him again to labor with his pen, or speak to small audiences. He urged upon the Society the importance of having a permanent minister; and sent his own resignation of his position as pastor. The communication closed with an expression of his continued and fervent sympathy with the congregation and all its members, and a promise of his cooperation with them in the future as in the past, though their official connection was sundered. Mr. Dudley expressed the desire that Mr. Parker should remain their pastor while Mr. Parker lived, under whatever circumstances, and moved that the Society should not accept the resignation. Mr. Leighton offered a resolution to the same effect. The motion was carried, with but two or three votes in the negative, and the resolution was adopted unanimously. The Committee was instructed to notify Mr. Parker of the action of the Society."

Mr. Theodore Tilton, in introducing the Rev. E. H. Chapin, a few days since, to an audience gathered in Mr. Beecher's church to hear him lecture, made a happy little speech, as follows:

"It was expected that Rev. Henry Ward Beecher would be present to introduce his friend, but he is unavoidably away this evening. This is unfortunate, for I think that with two such men in one pulpit we would have a spectacle of what Dr. Bellows calls the Broad Church (laughter). How far apart two men must stand to make a Broad Church, I do not know; but this I know, that Mr. Beecher and Mr. Chapin stand in two opposite theologies, and are so decided in their opinions that they never yet have come together, even to *take a glass of wine* (laughter). But I think I know their idea of a Broad Church. Some months ago a slave-woman from Virginia came to this congregation to plead for the purchase of her own freedom and that of her little children. Mr. Beecher stated the case, and three hundred dollars were raised on the spot. Only one hundred dollars more were needed. What should be done? We sent the woman to Mr. Chapin's church. He, in like manner, mentioned the case to his own people, and the woman and her child—her little boy holding out his cap in his hand—were stationed at the church door to receive the contributions of the congregation as they passed out. When the money was counted, it was found to be almost twice as much as was wanted! So that the church on Brooklyn Heights reached out its hand to the church across the river, and the church across the river reached back its hand in fellowship to the church on Brooklyn Heights, and beneath their united hands, or under their double benediction, stood one of God's children, whose bonds were newly broken, and whose head was newly crowned with liberty—while high above all stood the great Father and Head of the Church, who looked down and said, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my little ones, ye have done it unto me!' That is the Broad Church! And I am happy to introduce a man who is broad enough to be one of its ministers."

SLAVE INSURRECTION IN VIRGINIA.

Twenty-two Men Filling all Virginia and Maryland with Terror.

Scenes of Excitement and Blood.

THE REBELLION PUT DOWN.

THE people of this city were startled by the telegraphic announcement, in the evening papers of Monday, that an insurrection of slaves had broken out at Harper's Ferry, Va., a small town on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, eighty-one miles from Baltimore, near the dividing line of Virginia and Maryland, and at the junction of the Potomac and Shenandoah rivers. The first reports were so confused that it was scarcely possible to understand the origin of the affair or to measure its consequences. We have now (Wednesday morning), however, a full, and, doubtless, pretty accurate, account of the whole matter in the telegraphic despatches and correspondence of the daily journals; and we shall use the little space at our command to put our readers in possession of the facts at the earliest possible moment.

The insurrection was planned and led by Captain John Brown, sometimes called "Old Brown of Ossawatomie," whose courage and prowess in defence of the Free State cause in Kansas have made his name familiar to the public ear. We have, at various times within the last two years, heard rumors that he was engaged in planning an insurrection of slaves, but we little expected that he would lead an assault so desperate as that at Harper's Ferry.

ORIGIN OF THE CONSPIRACY.

From The Baltimore American, Oct. 18.

Capt. Brown made his first appearance in Harper's Ferry more than a year ago, accompanied by his two sons—all three of them assuming the name of Smith. He inquired about land in the vicinity, and made investigations as to the probability of finding ores there, and for some time boarded at Sandy Point, a mile east of the Ferry. After an absence of some months, the elder Brown reappeared in the vicinity, and rented or leased a farm on the Maryland side, about four miles from the Ferry. They bought a large number of picks and spades, and this confirmed the belief that they intended to mine for ores. They were frequently seen in and about Harper's Ferry, but no suspicion seems to have existed that "Bill Smith" was Capt. Brown, or that he intended embarking in any movement so desperate or extraordinary. Yet the development of the plot leaves no doubt that his visit to the Ferry and his lease of the farm were all parts of his preparation for an insurrection which he supposed would be successful in exterminating slavery in Maryland and Western Virginia.

Brown's chief aid was John E. Cook, a comparatively young man, who has resided in and near the Ferry some years. He was first employed in tending a lock on the Canal, and afterwards taught school on the Maryland side of the river, and, after a brief residence in Kansas, where, it is supposed, he became acquainted with Brown, returned to the Ferry, and married there. He was regarded as a man of some intelligence, and known to be anti-slavery, but was not so violent in the expression of his opinions as to excite any suspicions.

These two men, with Brown's two sons, were the only white men connected with the insurrection that had been seen about the Ferry. All were brought by Brown from a distance, and nearly all had been with him in Kansas.

The first active movement in the insurrection was made at about 10 1-2 o'clock on Sunday night. William Williamson, the watchman of Harper's Ferry Bridge, whilst walking across toward the Maryland side, was seized by a number of men, who said he was their prisoner and must come with them. They conducted him to the Armory, which he found already in their possession. He was detained till after daylight, and discharged. The watchman who was to relieve Williamson at midnight found the bridge lights all out, and was immediately seized. Supposing it an attempt at robbery, he broke away, and, his pursuers stumbling over him, he escaped. The next appearance of the insurrectionists was at the house of Col. Lewis Washington, a large farmer and slave-owner, living about four miles from the Ferry. A party, headed by Cook, proceeded thither, and, rousing Col. Washington, told him he was their prisoner. They also seized all the slaves near the house, took a carriage horse and a large wagon with two horses. When Col. Washington saw Cook, he immediately recognized him as the man who had called upon him some months previous, and to whom he had exhibited some valuable arms in his possession, including an antique sword, presented by Frederick the Great to George Washington, and a pair of pistols, presented to Washington, both being heir-looms in the family. Before leaving, Cook wanted Col. Washington to engage in a trial of skill at shooting, and exhibited considerable skill as a marksman. When he had made the visit on Sunday night, he alluded to his previous visit and the courtesy with which he had been treated, and regretted the necessity which made it his duty to arrest Col. Washington. He, however, took advantage of the knowledge he had obtained by his former visit, to carry off all the valuable collection of arms, which he did not reobtain till after the final defeat of the insurrection.

From Col. Washington's he proceeded with him as a prisoner in the carriage, and twelve of the negroes in the wagon, to the house of Mr. Allstadt, another large farmer on the same road. Mr. Allstadt and his son, a lad of sixteen, were taken prisoners, and all their negroes within reach forced to join the movement. He then returned to the Armory at the Ferry. All these movements seem to have been made without exciting the slightest alarm in town, nor did the detention of Capt. Phelps's train.

It was not until the town was thoroughly waked up and found the bridge guarded by armed men, and a guard stationed at all the avenues, that the people discovered that they were prisoners. A panic appears to have immediately ensued, and the number of insurrectionists at once increased from fifty (which was probably their greatest force, including the slaves who were forced to join) to from five to six hundred. In the meantime a number of workmen, not knowing anything of what had occurred, entered the Armory, and were successively taken prisoners, until at one time they had not less than sixty men confined in the Armory. Among those thus entrapped were Armistead Ball, Chief Draughtsman of the Armory; Benjamin Mills, Master of the Armory; and J. E. P. Dangerfield, Paymaster's Clerk. These three gentlemen were imprisoned in the engine-house, which afterwards became the chief fortress of the insurgents, and were not released until after the final assault. The workmen were imprisoned in a large building further down the yard, and were rescued by the brilliant Zouave dash made by the Railroad Company's men which came down from Martinsburgh.

THE FIGHTING AND ITS RESULTS.

The news of the insurrection flying in all directions, an intense excitement was created in the surrounding region. The most exaggerated rumors gained currency. The people of Virginia and Maryland were in a panic, evidently fearing that the slaves generally were about to strike for "liberty or death." Troops flocked in from both States, and a company of U. S. Marines, under command of Col. Lee, was ordered out by the President of the United States.

We cannot find room for all the details of the fighting. Some of the insurrectionists were shot in the streets on Monday, a sort of guerilla war being kept up during the day. The attack on the arsenal, where the insurgents were entrenched, did not take place till Tuesday morning. Of this we give a brief report.

The cannon could not be used without endangering the safety of Col. Washington, Mr. Dangerfield, Mr. Ball and other citizens, whom they still held prisoners. The doors and walls of the building had been pierced for rifles, but it was evident that from these holes no range could be had, and that without opening the door they would be shooting in the dark. Many thought that the murder of the prisoners held was determined upon, and that a fight to the death would be the ending of their desperate attempt.

Whilst the people thus looked and speculated, the door was opened, and one of the men came out with a flag of truce, and delivered what was supposed to be terms of capitulation. The continued preparations for assault showed they were not accepted.

Shortly after 7 o'clock, Lieut. J. E. B. Stuart, of the first cavalry, who was acting as aid for Col. Lee, advanced to parley with the besieged, Samuel Stricler, Esq., an old and respectable citizen, bearing a flag of truce. They were received at the door by Capt. Cook. Lieut. Stuart demanded an unconditional surrender, only promising them protection from immediate violence and a trial by law. Capt. Brown refused all terms but those previously demanded, which were, substantially, "that they should proceed unpursued to the second toll-gate, when they would free their prisoners; the soldiers would then be permitted to pursue them, and they would fight, if they could not escape." Of course this was refused, and Lieut. Stuart pressed upon Brown his desperate position, and urged a surrender. The expostulation, though beyond ear shot, was evidently very earnest, and the coolness of the Lieutenant and the courage of his aged flag-bearer won warm praise.

At this moment the interest of the scene was most intense. The volunteers were arranged all around the building, cutting off an escape in every direction. The marines, divided into two squads, were ready for a dash at the door.

Finally, Lieut. Stuart, having exhausted all argument with the determined Capt. Brown, walked slowly from the door.

Immediately the signal for attack was given, and the marines, headed by Col. Harris and Lieut. Green, advanced in two lines on each side of the door. Two powerful fellows sprung between the lines, and, with heavy sledge-hammers, attempted to batter down the doors. The doors swung and swayed, but appeared to be secured with a rope, the spring of which deadened the effect of the blows. Failing thus, they took hold of a ladder some forty feet long, and, advancing at a run, brought it with tremendous effect against the door. At the second blow it gave way, one leaf falling inward in a slanting position. The marines immediately advanced to the breach, Major Russell and Lieut. Green leading. A shot from the interior was fired, and Lieut. Green, of the marine in front fell. The firing from the interior was rapid and sharp. They fired with deliberate aim, and for a moment the resistance was serious and desperate enough to excite the spectators to something like a pitch of frenzy. The next moment the marines poured in, the firing ceased, and the work was done, whilst cheers rang from every side, the general feeling being that the marines had done their part admirably.

When the insurgents were brought out, some dead and others wounded, they were greeted with execrations, and only the precautions that had been taken saved them from immediate execution. The crowd, nearly every man of which carried a gun, swayed with tumultuous excitement, and cries of "Shoot them!" "Shoot them!" rang from every side. The appearance of the liberated prisoners, all of whom, through the steadiness of the marines, escaped injury, changed the current of feeling and prolonged cheers took the place of howls and execrations.

In the assault, private Ruffert, of the marines, received a ball in the stomach, and was believed to be fatally wounded. Another received a slight flesh-wound.

The lawn in front of the engine-house, after the assault, presented a dreadful sight. Lying on it were two bodies of men killed on the previous day and found inside the house; three wounded men—one of them just at the last gasp of life, and two others groaning in pain. One of the dead was Brown's son. Oteway, the wounded man, and his son Watson were laying on the grass, the father presenting a gory spectacle. He had a severe bayonet wound in his side, and his face and hair were clotted with blood.

A short time after Capt. Brown was brought out, he revived and talked calmly to those about him, defending his course and avowing that he had only done what was right. He replied to questions substantially as follows:

Q. Are you Capt. Brown, of Kansas? A. I am sometimes called so.

Q. Are you Ossawatomie Brown? A. I tried to do my duty there.

Q. What was your present object? A. To free the slaves from bondage.

Q. Were any other persons but those with you now connected with the movement? A. No.

Q. Did you expect aid from the North? A. No; there were none connected with the movement but those who came with me.

Q. Did you expect to kill people in order to carry your point? A. I did not wish to do so, but you forced us to it.

Various questions of this kind were put to Captain Brown, which he answered clearly and freely, with seeming anxiety to vindicate himself.

He urged that he had the town at his mercy—that he could have burnt it, and murdered the inhabitants, but did not; he had treated the prisoners with courtesy, and complained that he was hunted down like a beast. He spoke of the killing of his son, which he alleged was done whilst bearing a flag of truce, and seemed very anxious for the safety of his wounded son. His conversation bore the impression of the conviction that whatever he had done to free slaves was right, and that in the warfare in which he was engaged he was entitled to be treated with all the respect of a prisoner of war. He seemed fully convinced that he was badly treated and had a right to complain. Although at first considered as dying, an examination of his wounds proved that they are not necessarily fatal. He expressed the desire to live and to be tried by his country. In his pockets nearly $300 were found in gold. Several important papers found in his possession were taken charge of by Col. Lee, on behalf of the government.

Besides Capt. Brown, the prisoners taken are his son, who is seriously injured in the abdomen, and is not likely to live; Edward Coppich, who belonged to Iowa; and a negro named Shields Green, who came from Pittsburgh to join Brown. The stories of all these men are precisely the same. They agree as to the objects proposed to be established, and the number of persons in the movement. Young Brown, in answer to a question, said there were parties in the North connected with the movement, thus differing with his father on this point. Coppich, the other white prisoner, is quite young, and seems less shrewd than the others. He said he did not wish to join the expedition, and, when asked, gave a reply which showed the influence which Brown had over him. He said: "Oh, you gentlemen don't know Capt. Brown; when he calls for us, we never think of refusing to come."

Several slaves were found in the room with the insurrectionists, but it is believed that they were there unwillingly. Indeed, Brown's expectation as to slaves rushing there was entirely disappointed. None seem to have come to him willingly, and in most cases were forced to desert their master. But one instance in which slaves made a public appearance with arms in their hands is related. A negro who had been sharply used by one of the town people, when he found that he had a pike in his hand, used his brief authority to arrest the citizen, and have him taken to the armory. The citizens imprisoned by the insurrectionists all testify to their lenient treatment. They were neither tied nor insulted, and, beyond the outrage of restricting their liberty, were not ill used. Captain Brown was also courteous to them, and at all times assured them that they should not be injured. He explained his purpose to them, and, whilst he had them (the workmen) in confinement, made an abolition speech to them. Col. Washington speaks of him as a man of extraordinary nerve. He never blanched during the assault, though he admitted in the night that escape was impossible, and that he would have to die.

During Tuesday morning one of Washington's negroes came in and reported that Capt. Cook was on the mountain, only three miles off; about the same time some shots were said to have been fired from the Maryland Hills, and a rapid fusillade was returned from Harper's Ferry. The Independent Greys of Baltimore immediately started on a scouting expedition, and in two hours returned with two wagons loaded with arms and ammunition, found at Capt. Brown's house. The arms consisted of boxes filled with Sharp's rifles, pistols, &c., all bearing the stamp of the Massachusetts Manufacturing Company, Chicopee, Mass. There were also found a quantity of United States ammunition, a large number of spears, sharp iron bowie-knives fixed upon poles, a terrible looking weapon, intended for the use of the negroes, with spades, pickaxes, shovels, and everything that might be needed—thus proving that the expedition was well provided for, that a large body of men were expected to be armed, and that abundant means had been provided to pay all expenses. How all these supplies were got up to this farm without attracting observation is very strange. They are supposed to have been brought through Pennsylvania.

The insurrectionists did not attempt to rob the Paymaster's Department at the Armory. A large amount of money was there, but it was not disturbed.

Perfect order having been restored, the military—with the exception of the United States marines, who remained in charge of the prisoners—left in various trains for home.

It is supposed that a considerable body of slaves have made their escape under the guidance of some of the insurgents.

The prisoners will probably all be hung, either by State or United States authority. It is a lamentable affair. But we have not room for a line of comment, and there are many facts that we cannot now state.

Later.—A despatch, dated at Baltimore on Wednesday, says:

"Last evening a detachment of Marines and some volunteers made a visit to Brown's house. The first visit was to the school-house, and not Brown's, as was stated yesterday. They found a large quantity of blankets, boots, shoes, clothes, tents, and fifteen hundred pikes, with large blades affixed.

"They also discovered a carpet-bag containing documents throwing much light on the affair, printed constitutions and by-laws of an organization, showing or indicating ramifications in various States of the Union. They also found letters from various individuals at the North—one from Fred Douglas, containing ten dollars from a lady for the cause; also, a letter from Gerrit Smith about money matters, and a check or draft by him for $100, endorsed by the cashier of a New York bank, name not recollected. All these are in possession of Governor Wise. The Governor has issued a proclamation offering $1,000 reward for Cook, and a large number of armed men are now scouring the mountain in pursuit of him."

THE SALEM STREET PASTOR DEFYING THE CHURCH.

WORCESTER, Oct. 5, 1859.

To the Editor of The National Anti Slavery Standard.

NOT anticipating the extent of the depravity that was developed by the Salem street pastor last Sunday, I was not on the watch, and so did not give a complete record of the position of things up to the date of my last note.

After the vote at its business meeting (before reported), to omit its next regular contribution to the A. B. C. F. M., a prominent member, who claims to be thoroughly anti-slavery, and so much so that he has not for eighteen years contributed to the American Board, because of its pro-slavery character, but who still has diligently led the opposition to all the proposed anti-slavery action of this Church, moved that all who chose to contribute to the Board on the regular occasion should have the privilege of handing their contributions to the Treasurer of the Church! Pending the discussion of this extraordinary motion, the meeting, by vote of 11 to 10, adjourned, thus negativing the proposed motion.

Judge, then, of my surprise on learning that the pastor, on Sunday last, gave notice that the contributions might be handed to the Treasurer! And it is boasted that a larger collection than usual was taken.

There is an example of defiance of Church votes, breach of faith and violation of decency and propriety, seldom found short of the orthodox priesthood. J. A. H.

HOW TO CIRCULATE PETITIONS.—Signers to the petition for a Personal Liberty law may be obtained at the polls on the day of election, at Church (in some cases) after the close of services, at any public meeting, at news rooms, at railroad stations, and in many other ways, according to circumstances. Only let every earnest anti-slavery person take hold of the work with a will, and ways and means will be at hand. Let there be a rivalry between New York and Pennsylvania as to which shall send the most petitions to their respective Legislatures.

THE WEYMOUTH ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR

WILL OPEN AT

Mr. Wales's Hall, Weymouth Landing, on the afternoon of OCTOBER 25th.

[HOURS of starting from the Old Colony dépôt, Boston, half-past 8 and half-past 2. Hours of return, half-past 10 and half-past 4.]

In the list of contributions, for many of which we are indebted to the kindness of friends in Worcester, Boston and elsewhere, especially in New York State, are a lot of gentlemen's buckskin and fur gloves, ladies' sleeves and collars, children's aprons, drawers, capes, toys. A few of the fine Weymouth-made comforts and basket-bedquilts. A few splendid crotchet toilette and table covers, sofa and chair covers, glass preserve sauces to accompany a tea or dinner-service. Needle-books, mats, stands, watch-cases in variety too great to specify.

☞ But above all the rest is the rare occasion now offered to our friends for the timely selection of New Year's Presents for ornamenting the library, chamber or parlor, or enriching the portfolio, consisting of oil and water-color drawings, framed and ready to hang up, line-engravings, lithographs and mezzotintos, not to be found in the print-shops—the works of distinguished English and French artists. The mere inspection of them will amply repay the slight admission-fee

There will be a social tea-party on the evening of the 27th, at which Mr. Quincy will preside and Messrs. Garrison and Phillips will speak—and a social dancing party on the evening of the 28th, both to close at seasonable hours. Refreshments will be constantly provided for distant friends at all hours of the day to suit their convenience; and it is hoped that all who hate slavery (and who in this neighborhood does not?) will take advantage of the pleasant autumn season, and come together from the four Weymouths, from Boston, from Abington, from Plymouth, Hingham, and all the towns between, from Brookline, Canton, and throughout Norfolk County—for invigorating social intercourse and anti-slavery coöperation.

The Ladies-Managers are in correspondence with eloquent and distinguished friends of the Enterprise, far and near, with the prospect of being able confidently to invite their friends to a festival of the mind and heart as well as a series of social meetings for rest and amusement.

Admittance to the Fair,	- - - -	12 cents.
" Tea-Party,	- - -	25 "
" Social Dancing Party,		50 "

Weymouth, Oct. 5, 1859.

☞ Friends from Boston who are completing their collection of flower groups and water-colors are especially notified of this occasion. Distance from Boston, three-quarters of an hour, and the Hall but a few steps from the dépôt on arriving at Weymouth Landing.

THE RECENT ELECTIONS.

JUDGING from the results in Maine, Vermont, Ohio, Iowa, Minnesota, and to some extent in Pennsylvania, the anti-slavery sentiment of the voting people is by no means losing ground. In Pennsylvania only is there doubt. For there the "Opposition" is influenced, we fear, as much by other causes as by hatred of slavery. Could the same degree of anti-slavery feeling be aroused in Pennsylvania as exists in New York or Ohio, there would be much less discouragement in the aspect of coming events. The danger to the anti-slavery cause now is in the effort making by the Republicans to gain Pennsylvania by offering her a gilded bait. Pennsylvanians seem not to be aware that it is the Slave Power that prevents the enactment of a Tariff, and not the Free Traders, nor even the Democratic party, except so far as the latter is synonymous with the Slave Power. Make Pennsylvania an anti-slavery State, and the whole face of things at the North would be changed. Timid politicians would take courage. Availability would not stand in the way of principle. Prominent public journals would dare to speak their anti-slavery sentiments. Legislatures would not fear to pass Personal Liberty laws. And clergymen would no longer shun to declare the whole counsel of Freedom. So it appears to the

POLITICAL ABOLITIONISTS.

Summary.

"SUSPENSE,"—The Boston *Transcript*, alluding to Dr. Bellows's "Sequel to the Suspense of Faith," says: "If words mean anything, there has been a 'suspense' of something else besides 'faith' on the part of the preacher." What does this mean?—*Christian Enquirer.*

A suspense of common sense.—*Boston Transcript.*

NEGRO HUNG.—A negro man was hung by the sheriff of Plymouth, in Washington Co., N. C., on last Friday, in presence of 3 000 spectators, for the murder of a white man last February. The culprit had reason to suspect undue familiarity on the part of the white man with his wife, so he procured a pistol and shot him dead. [What a contrast between the treatment of the negro husband and that awarded to D. E. Sickles in similar circumstances!]

A WHITE MAN KILLED BY A NEGRO—A MOB HANGS THE NEGRO.—Mr. Hines, of McLean County, Ky., sold a negro to a Mr. Hancock. The negro did not like the transfer, and it was concluded to send him to Calhoun, the county seat of McLean, for safe keeping, until his master should call for him. Mr. Jerome Culver was requested to take charge of him, the negro resisted, drawing a knife and killing Mr. Culver. A great excitement was caused by the act, drawing together a mob, when the negro was forcibly taken from the officers, and hung on a tree.

DEPARTURE OF EMANCIPATED NEGROES—*Don't Want to Leave.*—On Sunday last, a crowd of not less than one thousand negroes assembled on the basin to take leave of the negroes belonging to the estate of the late Mr. Francis B. Shackleford, of Amherst County, who, in accordance with the will of the deceased, were about to depart, by way of the canal, for a free State. The whole number set free was forty-four, men, women and children, but only thirty-seven left, the balance preferring to remain in servitude in Old Virginia, rather than enjoy their freedom elsewhere. Some of those who did leave were thrown on the boat by main force, so much opposed were they to leaving, and many expressed their determination of returning to Virginia as soon as an opportunity offered.—*Lynchburgh (Va.) Republican.*

THE FAVORITE AS USUAL.—The Wheeler & Wilson sewing machine has won the highest premiums at all the Fairs of the season where ever exhibited. We may instance, as already held, the United States Agricultural Fair, the Fair of the St. Louis Mechanical Association, and the State Fairs of Maine, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and numerous County Fairs. At the United States Agricultural Fair at Chicago, about thirty varieties of sewing machines were exhibited. The award to this machine was the usual medal, as the highest premium and a special premium of a silver pitcher, valued at $100.

ALL OF A TREMBLE.—The Secretary of one of our Insurance Companies not long since advertised for a book-keeper, and received in response the following letter, which is so original and business-like that we are permitted to copy it, as a guide to other applicants for similar situations. The writer thoughtfully enclosed a leaf cut from an old account book, as a sample of his work. Either the applicant is an original genius or a wag of the first water:

"BIG TAGER, Wilkes Co., Ga.

"My Dr. Sir: I am a wanting of a situation in book-keeping, and Mr. Shirman said how that you would like to get me in your office. If so please answer to oncet. I send you a specimen of my single entry, but I can keep em double as well. I am all of a tremble, having just been licking a nigger.

"From yours truly, F. S. HIRSHFELDER."

—*Journal of Commerce.*

THE SON OF AN HON. NOT ALLOWED TO VOTE.—On Tuesday a colored man presented his vote at the first ward poll, when he was refused the privilege by the board of Democratic Judges. He demanded to be sworn, when one of the Judges proceeded to question him to prove that he was of African blood. He inquired the complexion of his mother.

"She is half white, her father being a white man," replied the colored man.

"Is your father of African descent?"

"No sir, my father is a white man, and a Democratic member of the Legislature of North Carolina!"

The Democratic Judges witted at this, amidst the shouts of laughter raised at their expense, and concluded that they would not question any further.

Moral—Democratic Election Judges should proceed cautiously in inquiring into the pedigree

THE STANDARD.

*FRATERNITY LECTURE.**

BY WENDELL PHILLIPS.

MR. PRESIDENT AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I feel half inclined to borrow a little wit from an article in a late number of the *Atlantic Monthly*—"My Double, and how he undid me"—and say, "I agree entirely with the gentleman who has just taken his seat" (laughter). "So much has been said, and so well said, that I feel there is no need of my occupying your attention" (renewed laughter). But then I should lose the hearty satisfaction it gives me to say with what delight I stand upon this platform, and how sincerely I appreciate the honor you do me, Mr. Chairman, in allowing me to aid in opening this course of lectures. I know, sir, that you hoped, as I did, that this post would be filled by our great Senator, who seeks health on a foreign soil. No one laments more sincerely than I do that he felt it impossible and inconsistent with his other duties to be here. It is not too much to say that the occasion was worthy of a word even from CHARLES SUMNER (hearty applause).

Appreciating the Lyceum system as I do, looking upon it as one of the departments of the National school, truly American in its origin, and eminently Republican in its character and end, I feel how eloquently his voice would have done it justice. For this is no common evening, Mr. President. The great boast of New England is liberal culture and toleration. Easier to preach than to practise! Many lyceums have opened their doors to men of different shades of opinion, and some few have even granted a fair amount of liberty in the choice of subject, and the expression of individual opinion. None of us can forget, on such an occasion as this, the eminently catholic spirit and brilliant success of that course of Anti-Slavery Lectures, in the winter of 1854 and 1855, which we owed chiefly to the energy and to the brave and liberal spirit of Dr. James W. Stone. But you go, gentlemen, an arrow's flight beyond all Lyceums; for, recognizing the essential character of civilization, you place upon your platform the representatives of each sex and of both races. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, you will listen to consummate eloquence, never heard in Boston before, from the Lyceum platform, because "guilty of a skin not colored like our own" (applause). And you will listen, besides, to woman, gracefully standing on a platform that boasts itself the source of national education. For decent justice has never been done to woman, in regard to her influence, either upon literature or society; and I welcome with inexpressible delight the inauguration of a course of lectures, national and American, in the proper sense of the words.

There are men who prate about "Nationality," and "the Empire," and "manifest destiny"—using brave words, when their minds rise no higher than some petty mass of white States making money out of cotton and corn. My idea of American nationality makes it the last, best growth of the thoughtful mind of the century, treading under foot sex and race, caste and condition, and collecting on the broad bosom of what deserves the name of an Empire, under the shelter of noble, just and equal laws, all races, all customs, all religions, all languages, all literature and all ideas. I remember, a year or two ago, they told us of a mob at Milwaukee that forced a man to bring out the body of his wife, born in Asia—which, according to the custom of her forefathers, he was about to burn—and compelled him to submit to American funeral rites, which his soul abhorred. The Sheriff led the mob, and the press of the State vindicated the act. This is not my idea of American civilization. They will show you at Rome the stately column of the Emperor Trajan. Carved on its outer surface is the triumphal march of the Emperor, when he came back to Rome, leading all nations, all tongues, all customs, all races, in the retinue of his conquest; and they traced it on the eternal marble, circling the pillar from base to capital. Just such is my idea of the Empire—broad enough and brave enough to admit both sexes, all creeds, and all tongues in the triumphal procession of this great daughter of the west of the Atlantic (loud applause). That is the reason why I hail this step in Boston—the brain of the Union—saying to the negro and to woman, "Take your place among the teachers of American Democracy" (applause).

I said justice had never been done to woman for her influence upon literature and society. Society is the natural outgrowth of the New Testament, and yet, nothing deserving of the name ever existed in Europe until two centuries ago, in France, woman called it into being. Society—the only field where the sexes have ever met on terms of equality—the arena where character is formed and studied—the cradle and the realm of public opinion—the crucible of ideas—the world's university—at once a school and a theatre—the spur and the crown of ambition—the tribunal that unmasks pretension and stamps real merit—the power that gives government leave to be, and outruns the lazy church in fixing the moral sense of the age—who shall fitly describe the lofty place of this element in the history of the last two centuries? Who shall deny that, more than anything else, it deserves the name of the most controlling element in the history of the two centuries just finished? And yet this is the realm of woman, the throne which, like the first conqueror, she founded and then filled.

So with literature. The literature of three centuries ago is not deceut to be read; we expurgate it. Within a hundred years, woman has become a reader, and for that reason, as much or more than anything else, literature has sprung to a higher level. No need now to expurgate all you read. Woman, too, is now an author; and I undertake to say that the literature of the next century will be richer than the classic epochs, for that cause. Truth is one forever, absolute; but opinion is truth filtered through the moods, the blood, the disposition of the spectator. Man has looked at creation, and given us his impressions, in Greek literature and English, one-sided, half-way, all awry. Woman now takes the stand to give us her views of God's works and her own creation; and exactly in proportion as woman, though equal, is eternally different from man, just in that proportion will the literature of the next century be doubly rich, because we shall have both sides. You might as well plant yourself in the desert, under the changeless gray and blue, and assert that you have seen all the wonders of God's pencil, as maintain that a Male Literature, Latin, Greek or Asiatic, can be anything but a half part, poor and one-sided; as well develop only muscle, shutting out sunshine and color, and starving the flesh from your angular limbs, and then advise men to scorn Titian's flesh and the Apollo, since you have exhausted manly beauty, as think to stir all the depths of music with only half the chords (applause). The diapason of human thought was never struck till Christian culture summoned woman into the republic of letters; and experience as well as nature tells us, "what God hath joined, let not man put asunder" (applause).

I welcome woman, therefore, to the platform of the world's teachers, and I look upon the world, in a very important sense, as one great school. As Humboldt said, ten years ago, "Governments, religion, property, books, are nothing but the scaffolding to build a man. Earth holds up to her Master no fruit but the finished man." Education is the only interest worthy the deep, controlling anxiety of the thoughtful man. To change Bryant a little:

> ——"the hills
> Rock-ribbed, and ancient as the sun,
> The venerable woods, rivers that move
> In majesty, and the complaining brooks
> That make the meadows green, and, poured round all,
> Old Ocean's gray and melancholy waste,
> Are but the solemn decorations all
> Of the great *school* of man."

It is in that light and for that value that I appreciate the lyceum. We have four sources of education in this country—Talk, Literature, Government, Religion. The Lyceum makes one and the most important element of each. It is a church, without a creed, and with a constant rotation of clergymen (applause). It teaches closer ethics than the pulpit. Let Lyceum Committees debate whether they shall invite Theodore Parker, or Theological papers scold because Beecher stands on your platform, and out of the debate the people will pick a lesson of toleration better, more real and more impressive, than Locke's Treatise or a dozen sermons could give them. Responsibility teaches as nothing else can. That is God's great motor power. When your horse cannot move his load, throw a sack of grain on his back and he draws easily on. He draws by weight, not by muscle. Give the masses nothing to do, and they will topple down thrones and cut throats; give them the government, as here, and they will make pulpits useless and colleges an impertinence. It is the best part of literature, too, for it is the only part that is vital. I value letters. I thank God that I was taught for many years; enough to see inside the sham.

The upper tier of letters is mere amateur; does not understand its own business. William H. Prescott would have washed his hand twice over had Walker the filibuster grasped it, unwittingly, but he sits down in his study and writes the history of fillibusters, respectable only because they died 300 years ago! He did not know that he was the mere annalist of the Walkers and Jefferson Davises of that age (applause).

In this connection Mr. P. referred to Bunyan and to Shakspeare, by way of illustrating his point that the literature which is of use is the literature that is not honored as such when it is written.

So it is with government. Government arrogates to itself that it forms men. As well might the man down here in the Court-house, who registers the birth of children, imagine that he was the father of all the children he registers (loud laughter). Everybody knows that government never began anything. It is the whole world that thinks and governs. Books, churches, governments are what we make them. France is Catholic, and has got a Pope, but she is the most tolerant country in the world. New England is Protestant, and has toleration written all over her statute-book, and she has a Pope in every village, and the first thing that tests a boy's courage is to dare to differ from his father (applause). Popes! why, we have got two as signal Popes as they had in Europe three centuries ago—there is *Bellows* at Avignon and *Adams* at Rome (great merriment, followed by loud applause). So with government. Men think government forms. Let us take an example.

Take Sir Robert Peel and Webster as measures and examples; two great men, remarkably alike. Neither of them ever had an original idea (laughter). Neither kept long any idea he borrowed. Both borrowed from any quarter, high or low, North or South, friend or enemy. Both were weathercocks, not winds; creatures, not creators. Yet Peel died England's idol—the unquestioned head of the statesmen of the age; Webster the disgraced and bankrupt chief of a broken and ruined party. Why? Examine the difference. Webster borrowed free trade of Calhoun, and tariff of Clay; took his constitutional principles from Marshall, his constitutional learning from Story, and his doctrine of treason from Mr. George Tickenor Curtis (laughter); and he followed Channing and Garrison a little way, then turned doughface in the wake of Douglas and Davis (applause and a few hisses); at first, with Algernon Sydney (my blood boils yet as I think how I used to declaim it), he declared the best legacy he could leave his children was free speech and the example of using it; then of Preston S. Brooks and Legree he took lessons in smothering discussion and hunting slaves. In 1820, when the world was asleep, he rebuked the slave trade; in 1850, when the battle was hottest, he let Everett omit from his works all the best anti-slavery utterances!

Sir Robert Peel was just like him. He "changed every opinion, violated (so says one of the Reviews) every pledge, broke up every party, and deserted every colleague he ever had," yet his sun went down in glory. Why? Because his step was ever onward; he lived to learn. Every change was a sacrifice, and he could truly use, in 1829, the glorious Latin Webster borrowed of him, "*Vera pro gratis*"—"I tell you unwelcome *truth*." But Webster's steps, crab-like, were backwards (applause and hisses). "Because thou art virtuous, shall there be no more cakes and ale?" Because you have your prejudices, shall there be no history written? Our task is unlike that of some meetings of late—*History*, not flattery (applause). Webster moved by compulsion or calculation, not by conviction. He sunk from free trade to a tariff; from Chief-Justice Marshall to Mr. George Tickenor Curtis; from Garrison to Douglas; from Algernon Sydney to the slave overseers. I read in this one of the dangers of our form of government. As De Tocqueville says so wisely, "The weakness of a Democracy is that, unless guarded, it merges in despotism." Such a life is the first step, and half a dozen are the Niagara carrying us over.

But both "builded better than they knew." Both forced the outward world to think for itself, and become statesmen. No man, says D'Israeli, ever weakened government so much as Peel. Thank Heaven for that—so much gained. Changing every day, their admirers were forced to learn to think for themselves. In the country once I lived with a Democrat who never had an opinion on the day's news till he had read the Boston *Post* (laughter). Such close imitation is a little too hard. Webster's retainers fell off into the easier track of doing their own thinking. A German, once sketching a Middlesex County landscape, took a cow for his fixed point of perspective; she moved, and his whole picture was a muddle. Following Peel and Webster was a muddle: hence came the era of outside agitation—and those too lazy to think for themselves at least took a fixed point for their political perspective—Garrison or Charles Sumner, for instance.

Mr. Phillips continued by remarking that all the people had ever asked of government was, not to take a step ahead, but only to UNDO *its mistakes*, to take its foot from off its victim, take away its custom-houses, abolish its absurd and wicked legislation and free the slave. He then proceeded to urge upon his hearers the importance of free, individual thought—the questioning of whatever came before us, with an honest desire and effort to reach truth. He said:

We shall have enough to do if we do our duty. The world is awake—some wholly, and some only half. Men who gather their garments scornfully and close about them when their fellows offer to express sympathy for the bravest scholar and most Christian minister the liberal New England sects know—these timid little souls make daily uproar in the market-place, crying for a *broad* Church, a BROAD Church—and one who lives by venturing a bold theory to-day, and spending to-morrow in taking it back, finding that he has been

> "Dropping buckets into empty wells,
> And growing old in drawing nothing out,"

assures you that it is not cowardice, but lack of candles and of a liturgy, that makes him useless; and, kind-souled man, he apologizes, and begs us not to be startled with his strange new views, having lived so long in the thin air of his own vanity that he does not know we have had a broad Church for fifteen years—broad enough for all races and colors, all sects, creeds and parties, for heads and hearts too; broad enough to help the poor, teach the ignorant, shield the weak, raise the fallen, and lift the high higher, to honor God and earn the hate of bad men—ministered to by one whose broad diocese is bounded on the north by the limits of habitable land, runs west with civilization, and east with the English language, and on the south stretches to the line where men stop thinking and live only to breathe and to steal (loud applause).

This Broad Church reformer knows his place so little that he sneers at Spiritualism and Socialism, as "vices entitled to no terms." One, an honest effort, however mistaken, to make all men wholly and really brothers in life, property and thought; and the other, that reaching into the land of spirit, which has stirred the heart, and roused the brain, of the best men of all ages, and given to literature its soul. Does he give no heed to that profound maxim of Coleridge—"There are errors which no wise man will treat with rudeness, while there is a probability that they may be the refraction of some great truth still below the horizon"?

Yes, this "Broad Church!"—humanity would weep if it ever came, for one of its doctrines is that the Statute-Book is more binding than the Sermon on the Mount, and that the rights of private judgment are a curse. Save us from a Church not broad enough to cover woman and the slave, all the room being kept for the grog-shop and the theatre—provided the one will keep sober enough to make the responses, and the other will lend its embroidered rags for this new baby-house (laughter and applause).

The honors we grant mark how high we stand, and educate the future. The men we honor, and the maxims we lay down in measuring our favorites, show the level and morals of the time. Two names have been in every one's mouth of late, and men have exhausted language in trying to express their admiration and their respect. The courts have covered the grave of Mr. Choate with eulogy. Let us see what is their idea of a great lawyer. We are told that "he worked hard"—"he never neglected his client"—"he flung over the discussions of the forum the grace of a rare scholarship"—"no pressure or emergency ever stirred him to an unkind word." A ripe scholar—a profound lawyer—a faithful servant of his client—a gentleman. This is a good record surely. May he sleep in peace! What he earned, God grant he may have! But the bar that seeks to claim for such an one a place among great jurists must itself be weak indeed—for this is only to make him out the one-eyed monarch of the blind. Not one high moral trait specified; not one patriotic act mentioned; not one patriotic service even claimed. Look at Mr. Webster's idea of what a lawyer should be in order to be called great, in the sketch he drew of Jeremiah Mason, and notice what stress he lays on the religious and moral elevation, and the glorious and high purposes which crowned his life! Nothing of this now! I forget. Mr. Hallet did testify for Mr. Choate's religion (laughter and applause); but the law maxim is that a witness should be trusted only in matters he understands, and that evidence, therefore, amounts to nothing (merriment). Incessant eulogy; but not a word of one effort to lift the yoke of cruel or unequal legislation from the neck of its victim; not one attempt to make the code of his country wiser, purer, better; not one effort to bless his times or breathe a higher moral purpose into the community; not one blow struck for right or for liberty, while the Battle of the Giants was going on about him; not one patriotic act to stir the hearts of his idolators; not one public act of any kind whatever about whose merit friend or foe could even quarrel, unless when he scouted our great charter as a "glittering generality," or jeered at the philanthropy which tried to practise the Sermon on the Mount! When Cordus, the Roman Senator, whom Tiberius murdered, was addressing his fellows, he began: "Fathers, they accuse me of illegal words; plain proof that there are no illegal deeds with which to charge me." So with these eulogies—words, nothing but words; plain proof that there were no deeds to praise.

The divine can tell us nothing but that he handed a chair or a dish as nobody else could (laughter); in politics, we are assured he did not wish to sail outside of Daniel Webster; and the Cambridge Professor tells his pupils, for their special instruction, that he did not dare to think in religion, for fear he should differ from South-side Adams! (Loud laughter and applause.) The Professor strains his ethics to prove that a good man may defend a bad man. Useless waste of labor! In Egypt, travellers tell us that the women, wholly naked, are very careful to veil their faces. So the Professor strains his ethics to cover this one fault. Useless, sir, while the whole person is nude!

Yet this is the model that Massachusetts offers to the Pantheon of the great jurists of the world!

Suppose we stood in that lofty temple of jurisprudence—on either side of us the statues of the great lawyers of every age and clime—and let us see what part New England—Puritan, educated, free New England—would bear in that pageant. Rome points to a colossal figure and says—"That is Papinian, who, when the Emperor Caracalla murdered his own brother, and ordered the lawyer to defend the deed, went cheerfully to death, rather than sully his lips with the atrocious plea; and that is Ulpian, who, aiding his Prince to put the army below the law, was massacred at the foot of a weak, but virtuous throne."

And France stretches forth her admiring hands, crying "That is D'Agueseau, worthy, when he went to face an enraged king, of the farewell his wife addressed him—'Go! forget that you have a wife and children to ruin, and remember only that you have France to save.'"

England says: "That is Coke, who flung the laurels of eighty years in the face of the first Stuart, in defence of the people. This is Selden, on every book of whose library you saw written the motto of which he lived worthy, 'Before everything, *Liberty*?' That is Mansfield, silver-tongued, who proclaimed,

> 'Slaves cannot breathe in England; if their lungs
> Receive our air, that moment they are free.'

This is Romilly, who spent life in trying to make law synonymous with justice, and succeeded in making life and property safer in every city of the Empire. And that is Erskine, whose eloquence, spite of Lord Eldon and George the Third, made it safe to speak and to print."

Then New England shouts, "This is Choate—who made it safe to murder; and of whose health thieves asked before they began to steal."

Boston had a lawyer once, worthy to stand in that Pantheon; one whose untiring energy held up the right arm of Horace Mann, and made this age and all coming ones his debtors; one whose clarion voice and life of consistent example waked the faltering pulpit to its duty in the cause of temperance, laying on that altar the hopes of his young ambition; one whose humane and incessant efforts to make the penal code worthy of our faith and courage ranked his name with McIntosh and Romilly, with Benthan, Beccaria and Livingston. Best of all, one who had some claim to say with Selden, "Above all things, *liberty*," for in the slave's battle his voice was of the bravest—ROBERT RANTOUL (prolonged and hearty plaudits). He died crowned with the laurels both of the forum and Senate house. The Suffolk Bar took no note of his death. No tongue stirred the air of the Courts to do him honor. "When vice is useful, it is a crime to be virtuous," says the Roman proverb. Of that crime Beacon street, State street and Andover had judged Rantoul guilty.

The State, for the second time in her history, offers a pedestal for the statue of a citizen. Such a step deserves thought. On this let us dare to think. Always think twice when saints and sinners, honest men and editors agree in a eulogy (laughter). All wonders deserve investigation, specially when men dread it.

No man criticises when private friendship moulds the loved form in

> "Stone that breathes and struggles,
> Or brass that seems to speak,
> Such cunning they who dwell above
> Have given to the Greek."

Let Mr. Webster's friends crowd their own halls and grounds with his bust and statue. That is no concern of ours. But when they ask the State to join in doing him honor, we are natives of Massachusetts and claim the right to express an opinion.

It is a grave thing when a State puts a man among her jewels—especially one whose friends frown on discussion—the glitter of whose fame makes doubtful acts look heroic. One paper, a tea-table critic, warns a speaker not born in the State to cease his criticism of the Webster Statue. I do not know why Massachusetts may not import critics as well as heroes; for, let us be thankful, Webster was no Boston boy. But be sure you exercise your right to think NOW.

His eulogy has tasked the ripest genius and the heartiest zeal. Some men say his eulogist has no heart. That is a mistake and cruel injustice! As the French wit said of Gontenelle, he "has as good a heart as can be made out of brains" (laughter). No matter what act Webster did, no matter how foul the path he trod, he never lacked some one to gild it with a Greek anecdote, or hide it in a blaze of declamation! I do not say the deed was always whitened, but surely it was something that the eulogist shared the stain. They say in England that when Charles the Tenth, an exile in England, hunted there, others floundered through mud and water as they could, but the exiled king was followed by a valet who flung himself down in his path and Charles walked over him as indifferently as if he had really been a plank. How clean the king kept, I do not know. The valet got very muddy. A striking picture of Webster and his eulogists!

His bronze figure stands on the State House Green. It reminds me of some lines, written in an album by Webster, when asked to place his name under that of John Adams:

> "If by his name I write my own,
> 'Twill take me where I am not known;
> The cold salute will meet my ear—
> Pray, stranger, how did you come here?"

In the printed speech of Mr. Everett you will find three feet, exactly one yard, by newspaper measurement, about the North Eastern Boundary map, *with a red line on it!*—but not a line, or hardly one, relating to the great Treason of the Seventh of March, 1850. The words he dared to speak, his friends dare not repeat; the life he dared to live, his friends dare not describe, at the foot of his statue! To mention now what he thought his great achievement will be deemed unkind!

Mr. Everett's silence was wise. He could not blame; nature denied him the courage. He was too wary to praise, for he recollected the French proverb, "Some compliments are curses." So he obeyed the English statesman's rule, "When you have nothing to say, be sure and say nothing."

But that is the printed speech. It seems some meddlesome fellow stood within reach of the speaker, and actually circulated, it is said, petitions for the removal of the statue from the public grounds. Then the orator forgot his caution, and interpolated a few unpremeditated sentences, "very forcible and eloquent," says the press, for this critic; termed this impudent meddler, "Mr. Immaculate," and quoted for his special benefit the parable of the Pharisee and Publican—"God be merciful to me a sinner." Singular eulogy—to make out his idol a miserable "sinner"! (Laughter.) Is this the usual method, Mr. Chairman, of proving one's right to a statue? The Publican repented, and was forgiven; but is a statue, ten feet high, cast in bronze, a usual element of forgiveness? And, mark, the Publican *repented*. When did Mr. Webster repent, either in person or by the proxy of Mr. Edward Everett? We have no such record. The sin is confessed, but there's no repentance!

Let us look a little into this doctrine of statues for sinners. Take Aaron Burr. We will omit his private life, it might suggest comparisons (laughter and applause). Tell of his daring in Canada—his watch on the Hudson—of submissive juries, of his touching farewell to the Senate. "But then there was that indiscretion as to Hamilton." Well, Mr. Immaculate, remember "the Publican." Or suppose we take Benedict Arnold: brave in Connecticut, gallant at Quebec, recklessly daring before Burgoyne! "But that little peccadillo at West Point!" Think of "the Publican," Mr. Immaculate. Why, on this principle, one might claim a statue for Milton's Satan. He was brave, faithful to his party, eloquent, shrewd about many a map "with a red line on it"! There's only that trifle of the apple to forgive and forget in these generous and charitable days! No, if he wants an illustration, with due humility, I can give the orator a great deal better one. Sydney Smith had a brother as witty as himself, and a great hater of O'Connell. "Bobus Smith" (for so they called him) had one day marshalled O'Connell's faults at a dinner talk, when his opponent flung back a glowing record of the great Irishman's virtues. Smith looked down a moment. "Well, such a man—such a mixture; the only way would be to hang him first, and then erect a statue to him under the gallows." A disputed statue rising out of a sea of angry contempt, half-hearted admiration, and apologetic eulogy, reminds me of the Frenchman tottering up, at eighty years old, to vote for Louis Bonaparte. "Why, he is a scoundrel," said Victor Hugo. "True—very true—but he is a *necessary* scoundrel." "I had rather," says Cato, "that men would ask why I had not a statue than why I had"; and the gentle pen of Joseph Addison could record, as he wandered through the poet's corner of Westminster Abbey, "I find many a poet without a monument, many a monument without a poet."

Ah, as the Greek said, "many men know how to flatter, few men know how to praise." These Cambridge professors and fair weather eulogists have no ability to measure Webster—either his capacity or his faults. They were dazzled blind by the splendor of his endowments, they were lost in the tumult of his vices. Theodore Parker's estimate is the truest ever made. History will adopt it as her verdict. His head and heart were the only ones large enough to grasp the subject, and brave enough to paint it truly (enthusiastic applause). The real admirer of Webster turns from these French daubs to find there the cool, truthful tone of Raphael, and feels that the statesman has met there his kindest critic, and the man his most appreciating judge. Accuse us not if we award him blame as well as praise. As I said just now, our task is history, not flattery. I know well that every statesman must compromise; but, as Macaulay says, "A public man is often under the necessity of consenting to measures he dislikes, to save others he thinks important. But the historian is under no such necessity. On the contrary, it is one of his most sacred duties to *point out* CLEARLY the errors of those whose general conduct he approves." If this be true of "*errors*," how still more sacred this duty when the question is one of treachery to Liberty herself?

Blame me not that I again open the record, Mr. Chairman. His injudicious friends will not let him die. Indeed, the heavy yoke he laid on innocent and friendless victims frets and curses them yet too keenly to allow him to be forgotten. He reaps only what he sowed. In the Talmud, the Jews have a story that Og, King of Bashan, lifted once a great rock, to hurl it on the armies of Judah. God hollowed it in the middle, letting it slip over the Giant's neck, there to rest while he lived. This man lifted the Fugitive Slave bill to hurl it, as at Syracuse, on the trembling and hunted slave, and God has hung it like a millstone about his neck forevermore (applause). While the echoes of Everett's periods still lingered in our streets, as I stood with the fresh-printed sheet of his eulogy in my hand, there came to me a man, successful after eight attempts, in flying from bondage. Week after week he had been in the woods, half starved, seeking in vain a shelter. For months he had pined in dungeons, waiting the slow step of his master. At last God blessed his eighth effort, and he stood in Boston, on his glad way from the Vulture of the States to the safe refuge of English Law. He showed me his broad bosom scarred all over with the branding-iron, his back one mass of record how often the lash had tortured him for his noble efforts to get free. As I looked at him, the empty and lying eulogy dropped from my nerveless hand, and I thanked God that Statue and Eulogy both were only a horrid nightmare, and that there were still roofs in Boston, safe shelter for these heroic children of God's right hand (prolonged cheering).

But you and I, Mr. Chairman, were born in Massachusetts, and we cannot but remember that the character of the State is marked by the character of those it crowns. A brave old Englishman tells us the Greeks "had officers who did pluck down statues if they exceeded due symmetry and proportion. We need such now," he adds, "to order monuments according to men's merits." Indeed we do! Daniel Webster said on Bunker Hill, in one of his most glorious bursts of eloquence, "That motionless shaft will be the most powerful of speakers. Its speech will be of civil and religious liberty. It will speak of patriotism and of courage. It will speak of the moral improvement and elevation of mankind. Decrepid age will lean against its base, and ingenuous youth gather round it, speak to each other of the glorious events with which it is connected, and exclaim, thank God, I, also, am an American!" It is a glorious lesson, and the noble old shaft tells it daily.

But when ingenuous youth stand at his pedestal, what shall they say? "Consummate jurist! Alas, that your latest effort was to sneer at a 'Higher Law'! Most able and eloquent advocate! could you find no other cause to plead than that of our lowest instincts against our highest and holiest sentiments? Alas, that your last and ablest argument was the duty of hunting slaves! Sagacious statesman! Fated to die not very old, and yet live long enough to see all the plans of your manhood become obsolete ideas, except just those you had abandoned! Surely you were a great party leader! for you found the Whig party strong, spent life in its service, and died prophesying its annihilation; found it decent, at least in profession, left it despicable in utter shamelessness; found it the natural ally of free labor and free speech, stirred it to a contest with its rival in servile bidding for Southern fellowship, and left it despicable for the attempt, and still more despicable and ridiculous for its failure! The curses of the poor have blighted your laurels. You were mourned in celled houses and the marts of trade; but the dwellers in slave huts and fugitives along the highways thanked God, when you died, that they had one enemy the less. Wherever that terrible face turned, it carried gloom to the bondman. On how many a humble hearth did it cast the loftiest Christian principle to forbear calling down curses on your head!

"And yet, your flatterers tell us this was the 'grandest growth of our soil and institutions!' this the noblest heart Massachusetts can offer to the world for a place beside the Phocions and the Hampdens—the Jays and the Fayettes! Thank God, then, we are not Massachusetts men!"

When I think of the long term and wide reach of his influence, and look at the subjects of his speeches—the mere shells of history—drum and trumpet declamation—dry law, or selfish bickerings about trade—when I think of his bartering the hopes of four million of bondmen for the chances of his private ambition, I recall the criticism on Lord Eldon—"No man ever *did* his race so much good as Eldon *prevented*." Again, when I remember the close of his life spent in ridiculing the Anti-Slavery movement as useless abstraction, moonshine, "mere rub-a-dub agitation," because it did not minister to trade and gain, methinks I seem to see written all over his statue De Tocqueville's conclusion from his survey of French and American Democracy—"*The man who seeks freedom for anything but freedom's self is made to be a slave!*"

Monuments, anniversaries, statues, are schools, Mr. Webster tells us, whose lessons sink deep. Is this man's life a lesson which the State can commend to her sons? Professor Felton, as usual, embalmed his idol in a Greek anecdote. It is a good storehouse. Let us open it. In that great argument which gave us the two most consummate orations of antiquity, the question was whether Athens should grant Demosthenes a crown. He had fled from battle, and his counsels, though heroic, brought the city to ruin. His speech is the masterpiece of all eloquence. Of the accusation by Æschines, it is praise enough to say that it stands second only to that. In it Æschines warns the Athenians that in granting crowns they judged themselves, and were forming the characters of their children. His noble burst,

Τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, ἐὰν ἐπερωτῶσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ νεώτεροι πρὸς ποῖον χρὴ παράδειγμα, &c.

is worth translating:

"Most of all, fellow-citizens, if your sons ask whose example they shall imitate, what will you say? For you know well it is not music, nor the gymnasium, nor the schools that mould young men; it is much more the public proclamations, the public example. If you take one whose life has no high purpose, one who mocks at morals, and crown him in the theatre, every boy who sees it is corrupted. When a bad man suffers his deserts, the people learn—on the contrary, when a man *votes against what is noble and just* [how exactly he describes this case!], and then comes home to teach his son, the boy will very properly say, 'Your lesson is impertinent and a bore.' Beware, therefore, Athenians, remembering posterity will rejudge your judgment, and that the character of a city is determined by the character of the men it crowns."

I commend this page of Æschines to Mr. Felton.

Has the State, then, no worthier sons, that she needs import such poor material? Within her bosom rests the dust of Horace Mann, whose name hundreds of thousands of children on Western prairies, looking up to Massachusetts teachers, learn to bless. He bears the sceptre of Massachusetts influence to the shores of the Pacific. When at the head of our Normal School, a colored girl was admitted, and the narrow prejudice of Newton closed every door against her—"Come to my table; let my roof, then, be your home," said Mr. Mann (hearty applause). Antioch College staggered under $50,000 debt. One, bearing the form of a man, came to its President and said, "I will pay one-sixth, if you will promise me no negro shall enter its halls." "Let it perish first," was Horace Mann's reply (renewed and enthusiastic applause). The Legislature are asked to put his statue opposite Webster's. Oh, no. When the Emperor makes his horse a consul, honest men decline a share in the consulship. While that ill-used iron stands there, our State is in bad odor to offer statues to anybody.

At Reval, one of the Hanse towns, they will show you, in their treasury, the sword which, two hundred years ago, beheaded a lawless Baron for daring to carry off his fugitive slave from the shelter of the city walls. Our great slave-hunter is beyond the reach of man's sword; but if any noble soul in the State will stir our mother Massachusetts to behead his image, we will cherish the name of that true Massachusetts boy as sacredly as they keep the brave old sword at Reval (loud and prolonged applause).

---

* Introductory to the Fraternity Course, and delivered in the Tremont Temple, Boston, Oct. 4th.

FOR THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

MADGE VERTNER.

BY MATTIE GRIFFITH.

CHAP. XII.

SEVERAL weeks after the events recorded in the last chapter, Col. Vertner's travelling carriage, heavily laden and tightly packed on the outside with trunks and valises, was slowly winding through a public highway, lined on either side by a thick, deep forest. It was the middle of a warm afternoon in September. The sunlight flickered across the road, and played on the tree-tops, spotting the green leaves with golden specks. It was a lazy, drowsy time; the coachman was half asleep on his box, and the carriage moved but slowly. Mrs. Vertner, with her head on her husband's shoulder, was quietly enjoying her siesta, while the Colonel nodded over a book. On the front seat Helen Mason was also sleeping, with a gauze veil thrown over her pale face, and an open book on her lap. By her side was Madge Vertner, wide awake, gazing out of the carriage window upon the quiet woods, with an admiring eye. She looked very bright and happy. Glancing around at the sleepers, she said, half aloud, "what stupid people, to be sleeping at such a delightful time! I can't stand being cooped up here any longer"; and, opening the carriage door, she sprang lightly out, and bounded rapidly along the road for some distance, before the occupants of the carriage became aware of her absence. It was the third day of their journey, and they were now drawing near the Mammoth Cave; their route had lain through the middle counties of Kentucky, the scenery of which was very varied, occasionally wild and uncultivated, and then again rich and blooming with cultivated farms, or smiling with white-spired villages. Col. Vertner enjoyed the face of the country, and admired the farms; while Madge never tired of gazing at the old primeval trees of wonderful size. But Helen Mason remained unconscious of all around her, totally absorbed in her book, while Mrs. Vertner quarrelled with the slowness of the horses, complained of the ruggedness of the roads, and was totally out of patience with Madge, who had occasionally insisted upon mounting the box and driving the horses. And now, starting up from her nap, and missing her daughter, she exclaimed, "Where upon earth is that madcap child? I should not be surprised if she were again on the driver's box. Wake up, Col. Vertner, and see where Madge is."

Helen Mason started up, dropping her book from her lap, and exclaimed—"Why! Madge? she was here a moment ago."

Just then our heroine came running up to the carriage, with her arms full of flowers and leaves.

"Oh, papa," she cried out, "only see these beautiful things!" and, dashing the leaves and flowers into the carriage, she broke out into a long, loud peal of laughter, that seemed to wake the echoes of the woodlands.

"While you, old sleepy heads, were drowsing the time away in stupid sleep, I was scampering along the side of the woods, gathering those pretty things. Helen, you had better come out here than be cooped up in the carriage; come, let us take a walk. I met a man who told me we were only a few miles from the Cave, and I should like to walk the rest of the way, papa."

"Madge, Madge, are you crazy," said Mrs. Vertner, in a quick reproving tone; "come, get into the carriage immediately. A pretty sight it would be for you to be seen walking up to the hotel."

With reluctance Madge obeyed her mother, and entered the carriage with a sigh.

"How my little Madge hates a cage!" said her father, smiling. "I am glad she has not a pair of wings, or she would be flying away from us."

"Indeed she would," answered Madge, with a degree of fervor that surprised her father, and caused Helen Mason to start and exclaim—

"Why, Madge, would the possession of a pair of wings make you fly from your friends?"

"Sometime I would come back; but, Helen, don't you think it would be a delightful way to travel—sailing through the air, buoyed up by your own white, feathery wings, rather than creeping along at this pace?"

"It would be more practical, Madge—and perhaps more natural; for we rather seem defrauded of what would be a useful human appendage."

"What crazy talk!" exclaimed Mrs. Vertner. "I am astonished at you, Helen, for I thought you had more religious perception. Such talk sounds positively irreverent."

Helen was mortified, but Madge, who was used to her mother's reproofs, only laughed as she replied,

"Why, mamma, I should think that you would be very covetous of a pair of wings, since you seem to dislike walking and all other kinds of active exercise."

"I never care to criticize the workings of Divine Providence, my dear." There was an immense depth of self-satisfaction in Mrs. Vertner's tone, which effectually silenced Madge, and caused a most provoking smile on the part of the Colonel, as he glanced toward his child.

When within a few miles of the Mammoth Cave, they turned off from the main road and entered a quiet wooded road, more like a foot-path than the public entrance to a place of great resort. All travellers will remember the singular beauty and attractiveness, the quiet and repose, the coolness and stillness of the path. Madge was in ecstacies, and constantly swinging herself from the carriage window, calling out to the driver to halt or to drive more slowly—insisting, to her mother's terror, upon getting out and walking.

"Oh, I *shall* suffocate in this close, warm carriage; I *must* get out."

"No, Madgy dear, be patient a little longer; we shall soon be there, and then you may run and romp to your heart's content," said her father.

With a frown gathering upon her brow, and a vexed expression, Madge sank back into the carriage, and, covering her eyes with her hands, said:

"Since I can't be allowed to enjoy the cool shade and beautiful trees, I'll not look at them, but make a complete prisoner of myself."

When the driver pulled up in front of the hotel and opened the carriage door, Madge sprang out, exclaiming, "Well, I *am* glad to be free again."

The hotel, which had been put up for the accommodation of summer visitors, was a long, low, wooden building, painted white, with a trellised verandah, overgrown with grape vines, extending its entire length. Groups of persons were standing about the yard, on the verandah, and in the door-ways, while a party of two or three ladies and gentlemen, in fantastic Turkish costume, with tin lamps in their hands, were returning from an exploration of the Cave. Madge laughed outright, as she looked upon them.

"How funny they look, papa! Helen, only see!" and she pointed toward the group.

"Fie, fie, Madge," whispered Mrs. Vertner, "how very rude to point and remark upon strangers! You will give mortal offence; pray be more particular."

It was near tea time. Mrs. Vertner and Helen complained of fatigue; and Madge and her father wishing for an immediate visit to the Cave, were met by Mr. H., the proprietor, who told them that, for the sake of affording the guides rest, no admission to the Cave was allowed after six p. m.

"Let us venture without guides," urged the enthusiastic Madge, but, being overruled by her father and friends, she consented to wait until the morning.

Refusing all solicitations to visit the ball-room, or take part in the dance, she soon retired to her chamber. About an hour afterwards, Helen Mason came into the room, saying—

"Oh, Madge, I have just seen the celebrated guide, Stephen, and he is a splendid-looking creature."

"Is he not a negro?"

"No, you would scarcely take him for a mulatto or quadroon; he looks to me more like a handsome Spaniard, a Hidalgo, or a proud Mexican, with fine, straight hair, and deep electric eyes. I declare he is magnificent."

"But he is a slave," said Madge.

"He ought not to be."

"Why?"

"Because he looks like a gentleman."

Madge was silent for a moment, and then said, in a quick tone,

"Helen, when I was in the jail, where poor Jack and Milly were locked up, I felt as if *no* one should be a slave; I can never forget the impression those poor helpless fugitives made upon me. Helen, it did seem so strange to me to see a stout man like Jack so prostrated. He was not handsome, Helen; he did not look like your proud Mexicans or Spaniards; he was a poor, ignorant black fellow, who could not speak decent English, but he uttered some words that went direct to my heart, and some of his thoughts, though roughly expressed, seemed to cleave my adverse judgment like swords of justice, and change my whole way of thinking. Helen,